IMPLEMENTATION OF THE HELSINKI ACCORDS

HEARING

BEFORE THE

COMMISSION ON SECURITY AND COOPERATION IN EUROPE

NINETY-EIGHTH CONGRESS

SECOND SESSION

THE SITUATION OF ANDREI SAKHAROV AND UNOFFICIAL PEACE GROUPS IN THE U.S.S.R. AND EASTERN EUROPE

MAY 22, 1984

Printed for the use of the
Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe

U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE

37-500 WASHINGTON : 1984

J891-4

COMMISSION ON SECURITY AND COOPERATION IN EUROPE

DANTE B. FASCELL, Florida, *Chairman*
ROBERT DOLE, Kansas, *Cochairman*

ORRIN G. HATCH, Utah
JOHN HEINZ, Pennsylvania
ALFONSE M. D'AMATO, New York
CLAIBORNE PELL, Rhode Island
PATRICK J. LEAHY, Vermont
SIDNEY R. YATES, Illinois
TIMOTHY E. WIRTH, Colorado
EDWARD J. MARKEY, Massachusetts
DON RITTER, Pennsylvania
CHRISTOPHER H. SMITH, New Jersey

EXECUTIVE BRANCH

HON. ELLIOTT ABRAMS, Department of State
HON. RICHARD NORMAN PERLE, Department of Defense
VACANCY, Department of Commerce

R. SPENCER OLIVER, *Staff Director*
CATHERINE COSMAN, *Coordinator*
BRIAN FLORA, *Coordinator*
ROBERT HAND, *Coordinator*
BARBARA EDWARDS, *Administrative Assistant*

CONTENTS

IMPLEMENTATION OF THE HELSINKI ACCORDS

The Situation of Andrei Sakharov and Unofficial Peace Groups in the U.S.S.R. and Eastern Europe, May 22, 1984

WITNESSES

	Page
Drell, Dr. Sidney, director, Stanford University Linear Accelerator Center and personal friend of Dr. Sakharov	5
Batovrin, Sergei, member, Group to Promote Trust Between the U.S.S.R. and the U.S.A	20
Godyak, Valery, member, Group to Promote Trust Between the U.S.S.R. and the U.S.A	20
Sax, Dr. Boria, a New York-based writer, lecturer, and researcher on the human rights situation in Eastern Europe	41

MATERIAL SUBMITTED FOR THE RECORD

Telegram sent to President Konstantin Chernenko submitted by Dr. Sidney Drell	12
Written statement submitted by Sergei Batovrin and Valery Godyak	26
Written statement submitted by Dr. Boria Sax	44
Written statement submitted by Representative Edward J. Markey	57

STATEMENTS AND LETTERS SUBMITTED FOR THE RECORD

Written statement submitted by the Coordinating Committee of Hungarian Organizations in North America	61
Written statement submitted by the Joint Baltic American National Committee	69
Charter '77 letters and documents relating to the Peace Movement	75

PUBLIC HEARING ON THE SITUATION OF ANDREI SAKHAROV AND UNOFFICIAL PEACE GROUPS IN THE U.S.S.R. AND EASTERN EUROPE

TUESDAY, MAY 22, 1984

COMMISSION ON SECURITY AND COOPERATION IN EUROPE,
Washington, DC.

The Commission met, pursuant to notice, in room 2200, Rayburn House Office Building, Washington, DC, at 9:30 a.m., Representative Dante B. Fascell, chairman, presiding.

In attendance: Commissioners and Representatives Timothy E. Wirth, Edward J. Markey, Don Ritter, and Christopher H. Smith.

Also in attendance: R. Spencer Oliver, staff director and general counsel of the Commission.

OPENING STATEMENT OF CHAIRMAN FASCELL

Chairman FASCELL. The Commission will come to order.

I'm pleased to welcome our witnesses here today. They have made major contributions to the struggle for peace and human rights.

We are interested, of course, in the plight of Andrei Sakharov and Elena Bonner and the situation of the unofficial peace groups in the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe.

It is one of the cruel ironies of our time that the Soviet Union, which supports popular peace groups in the West, is unable to abide independent efforts by its own citizens to express similar views or opinions within the Soviet Union.

The first such private peace group in the Soviet Union originated in the three Baltic States of Lithuania, Estonia, and Latvia. And in 1918, 38 Estonians, Latvians, and Lithuanians issued a statement asking that their countries be included in an official Soviet proposal to create a Nordic nuclear free zone. And since then, at least five of the members of that group have been imprisoned.

In June 1982, 15 Soviet citizens in Moscow organized another unofficial peace group, the Group to Establish Trust Between the United States and the U.S.S.R. The main aim of this group is to promote a four-sided dialog between the Soviet and American Governments and their peoples.

For those of you who want to get further acquainted with the documents of this remarkable group, I want to call your attention to a just released 150-page Helsinki Commission staff compilation and translation of the major documents of the Soviet Trust Groups.

We have just received word of the latest development connected with the Moscow Trust Group with the arrest, on May 19, of four Trust Group activists as they were standing on a Moscow street collecting signatures for a petition calling on the Soviet and American Governments to return to the negotiating table.

They had managed before they were arrested to collect 300 signatures.

Three of the people were released after several hours of interrogation. One is still in custody.

Earlier this month the world learned that the Kremlin has now apparently decided to take further repressive actions against a great man of peace and science, Dr. Andrei Sakharov and his brave wife, Elena Bonner.

In a series of scurrilous attacks, the Soviet media has announced that Elena Bonner, a member of the Moscow Helsinki Group, is now under threat of criminal prosecution. The Soviet authorities are now holding Elena Bonner incommunicado with her husband in the closed city of Gorky.

Andrei Sakharov, driven to desperation by the refusal of Soviet authorities to act on his wife's request to be allowed to go to the West for medical treatment for her heart and glaucoma conditions, has been on a hunger strike since May 2. According to recent unconfirmed reports, Dr. Sakharov was removed from his apartment on May 7, and is now presumably in a hospital.

Despite the increasing world interest and outcry over the plight of the Sakharovs, the Soviets retain their silence, and they just continue their attacks on Elena Bonner.

I look forward to hearing more about these critical subjects from our witnesses. Everyone should know, and certainly the Soviet Government should know, that these issues, along with other human rights concerns, are crucial to the improvement of our bilateral relations.

Every time I've had an opportunity to talk to any Soviets officials on any matters, I've certainly made that clear. And I guess we'll have to continue doing everything we can to be sure they get the message. The Soviets seem to keep thinking that the matters can be separated, particularly commercial aspects of relations, from all human rights and from all political matters.

Of course, the Soviets have a compartmentalized view of the world and they insist on trying to keep it that way if they can. I think they pursue a course of action which attempts to isolate those things which are of benefit to them and ignore the matters which annoy them in any way. It seems to me that's rather typical of the Soviet attitude and it's not surprising that a people, or government, or those who are in power would want their cake and eat it, too, so to speak. And that's certainly a Soviet attitude, aside from the very frightening elements which seem to permeate the leadership of that society in terms of fear—fear of knowledge, fear of independence, fear of freedom of thought, freedom of conscience, freedom of religion, and all of the other things that seem to frighten them to death.

I always find that fear difficult to understand in a nation, a group of people who are so powerful, so talented, and have, generally speaking, given the world so much heretofore. I find it, some-

times, depressing that we can't communicate better and that we can't have better understandings.

But I think it has to be clear to the Soviets—and certainly one of the responsibilities of this Commission has been to make it clear in whatever our relations are going to be—that one of the fundamental values that we're concerned about is the value of the individual, the dignity of the individual, so-called human rights. And the relationship between states must take that into account. That's what the Helsinki accords say. That's what common sense says. That's what many international documents say.

I'd like for my colleagues to make whatever statements they want to make at this point, and then we'll call the witnesses up.

Mr. Ritter.

Mr. RITTER. I thank the chairman for recognizing me and for his leadership in this area, going back many years.

I, too, agree that the Soviets, with all their might and all their power, should not be so concerned for basic questions of individual human rights. But if you look below the surface, you will find that if human rights are granted, and if the basic human rights that we take for granted are enjoyed by the Soviet citizens, the power structure of powerful hierarchies reaching down in an iron grasp on the people will not be retained for very long.

In many ways, human rights is the enemy of the Soviet elites and their power structure.

It's interesting that on May 19, four Soviet activists were arrested for handing out literature, or for seeking signatures on a petition to get both sides to come back to the negotiating table. I think it's a remarkable event for the American people to witness.

I've heard about it here today through our chairman. I suppose it must have been in the press somewhere. It certainly wasn't on the front pages.

But that does put it in perspective, somewhat, where our two countries are at least attempting to go to the negotiating table and discuss these very difficult matters.

I recall the debate in the House last week on MX. And to hear many people talk, the United States of America was responsible for lack of progress at the arms-negotiating table. I sense we are witnessing something quite different in the Soviet behavior. Either there is no real power structure there, and the only response they are giving to us is a response of hardline, hardnosed, threatening behavior, or they have planned it this way.

I'd like to call attention to a series of actions not only in the repression of their own domestic peace movement, but in other actions as well. If you go from the KAL airliner, the behavior after the airliner was shot down, and the recent award of a medal to the pilot of the plane, if you go to the pullout from the Olympics, if you go to the massive increase in hostilities—yes, a massive, new type of war is being fought in Afghanistan, with Sequoian and Tupelo bombers engaged for the first time, if you look at what they're doing with their leading dissident, Andrei Sakharov, if you look at the recent announcement of submarines off our coast, and although they have been off the coast, and this is probably not too different from what they have been doing recently, it indicates that they are seeking to threaten us by these various political and mili-

tary actions. They really seem to have embarked on a series of threats and pressures that can only be interpreted as either coming out of a new line of policy of Soviet leadership, or a desire to influence the political climate in the United States, especially seeking to influence the Presidential election by showing that this current administration cannot be friendly with the Soviet Union, and therefore, that we should choose another path.

I look forward to the testimony today in regard to Andrei Sakharov from Dr. Drell. I look forward to the testimony from Sergei Batovrin on the real Soviet peace movement. Dr. Sax, I look forward to your testimony on the East German movement. And Valery Godyak for his testimony on the Moscow Trust Group.

And I would hope that rather than totally focusing on the individual events, they could, in addition to that, tell us what this bodes for the larger picture of arms control, for the larger picture of our own peace movement in this country, for the larger picture of a possible new Soviet view of East-West relations.

I thank the chairman for the time.

Chairman FASCELL. Mr. Wirth.

Mr. WIRTH. Thank you, Mr. Fascell. You are having this hearing and I think it is very important that all of us continue to put as much pressure as possible, as much visibility as possible on this.

Unhappily, at least the situation of the Sakharovs is now on the evening news, and on the editorial pages, and people are increasingly aware and concerned about it. And at least, perhaps, this is a step in the right direction.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman FASCELL. Mr. Smith.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. Chairman, just a couple of comments.

I believe that your calling of this meeting this morning is very timely; it helps to bring further attention to the plight, the tragic plight of Andrei Sakharov and his wife.

Just to build a little on what my friend from Pennsylvania was pointing out, this breakdown in relationship between the U.S. and the U.S.S.R. really dates back to 1979. Since then we have seen, whether it be in the slave-labor-camp situation, or in the great reduction in the number of Soviet Jews who have been allowed to emigrate, the use of psychiatric prisons to oppress and to break Pentecostal Baptists and human rights dissidents, they are really accelerating the denial of human rights. They are aggressively pursuing those who would speak out forcefully and with courage as to the rights of their fellow man.

I think we have a duty and obligation as a free nation to not stand by idly, which we are not. I commend you for your leadership, Mr. Chairman, on this issue. You have been an outspoken advocate of human rights in the Soviet Union and other Eastern bloc nations. I think bringing further testimony and just building that record, and then actively pursuing this issue is certainly in the highest tradition of this country. I look forward to the several witnesses that we will be hearing today.

Chairman FASCELL. Dr. Sidney Drell, deputy director of the Stanford University Linear Accelerator Center, has served as an adviser to the U.S. Government, including the National Security Council, on arms control for over 25 years.

During a visit to Moscow for a Soviet Academy of Sciences seminar in 1974, Dr. Drell first met Andrei Sakharov, and Dr. Sakharov holds him in high esteem, and I can understand why.

We are delighted to have you here.

Dr. DRELL. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. I am pleased for the opportunity to be here.

I am privileged to know Andrei Sakharov and his wife, Elena Bonner, as close, personal friends. They are two of the most courageous people in our world today. A brilliant physicist, an eloquent and brave spokesman for human rights, and a stirring example of the freedom and dignity of the human spirit, Andrei Sakharov has become "the spokesman for the conscience of mankind" in the words of the citation for his Nobel Peace Prize in 1975.

Sadly, we are here today witnessing the unfolding of a tragedy as the Sakharovs continue their hunger strike. Andrei Sakharov started his fast 20 days ago in the city of Gorky, 250 miles east of Moscow, to which he had been banished in 1980, more than 4 years ago.

He began his fast when Elena Bonner was placed under investigation for defaming the Soviet system, threatened with charges of treason, and also barred from leaving Gorky.

Sakharov has declared this to be a fast to the very end, if the Soviet Government does not permit his wife to go abroad for desperately needed medical care.

It is also reported that Elena Bonner, who suffers a severe heart condition, joined in the hunger strike 10 days ago. In recent years, both Sakharovs have been in failing health, and the added strain of a prolonged fast on their already precarious health is a grave concern.

Why does the Soviet Government persecute the Sakharovs? Andrei Sakharov is a great scientist of whom the Government and the people of the Soviet Union can justly be very proud. He has added luster and distinction to their great scientific tradition.

His research contributions include the fundamental paper of the research effort in the Soviet Union toward controlled fusion. In it he described a confinement scheme for a hot plasma, famous today under the name "tokamak," which is one of the most promising methods now being pursued around the world for developing fusion as a practical source of energy.

In addition to many other contributions in a wide range of scientific research, he gave the first good reasons to believe that the proton, the nucleus of the hydrogen atom and the fundamental building block of nature, may not be stable and everlasting, but may decay just like other forms of subnuclear matter that we create in the laboratory. This bold suggestion of proton decay was developed by Sakharov in order to explain why our universe is made predominantly of matter and not antimatter. Major experimental efforts are now in progress to confirm or deny this theory.

Nor would it be appropriate to speak of Sakharov's scientific achievements in the past tense. Just 2 weeks ago I received a new, imaginative, and interesting research paper by him on cosmology, which we just had translated at Stanford. This is the fourth manuscript of his to arrive from Gorky since his exile there.

37-500 O—84——2

Honored in the Soviet Union as the father of their hydrogen bomb, Sakharov was elected in 1953, at the age of 32, the youngest full member of the Academy of Sciences of the U.S.S.R. He has been awarded many of their highest civilian medals, of which he has subsequently been stripped.

During the 1950's, Sakharov writes of becoming increasingly involved with a military-industrial complex "blind to everything except their jobs," and he tells of coming, and I quote him again: "to reflect in general terms on the problems of peace and mankind and, in particular, on the problems of a thermonuclear war and its aftermath."

His concern about the harmful effects of radioactive failout from atmospheric testing of nuclear bombs grew out of his involvement in the Soviet weapons program and led Sakharov to, and I quote him again: "an increased awareness of the moral problems engendered by such activities."

For more than a decade, Sakharov has spoken out strongly on the most urgent need to control the nuclear-arms race and to avoid nuclear war. Writing on nuclear arms in his 1975 book, "My Country and the World," he said, and I quote:

> The unchecked growth of thermonuclear arsenals and the build-up toward confrontation threaten mankind with the death of civilization and physical annihilation. The elimination of that threat takes unquestionable priority over all other problems in international relations. This is why disarmament talks, which offer a ray of hope in the dark world of suicidal nuclear madness, are so important.

Chairman FASCELL. Dr. Drell, may I interrupt you right there?

Dr. DRELL. Yes.

Chairman FASCELL. You know, what strikes me is I believe that. I agree with that statement personally.

Now, if I said the same thing in the United States, the difference is I can say it, and I wouldn't be in jail, or I wouldn't be in confinement.

But Sakharov is a great man, a great leader, a tremendous scientist, one of the greatest the world has ever known. And because he says such things which he believes as a matter of conviction not only for the benefit of his country, but for humanity generally, he winds up in confinement and may be destined to die because the Soviet leadership can't stand such statements coming from one of their citizens.

Dr. DRELL. Would you like me to comment now, or finish my statement, or how?

Chairman FASCELL. Either way. Finish your statement.

Dr. DRELL. Let me finish my statement, because I very much want to comment on that. I think it's a very important point, and I would like to comment on it.

Sakharov emphasized this theme once again in his letter to me last year on "The Danger of Thermonuclear War," that was so widely reported in the press and published in Foreign Affairs, in the summer of 1983. I'd like to quote briefly from that letter to me:

> On the whole, I am convinced that nuclear disarmament talks are of enormous importance and of the highest priority. They must be conducted continuously—in the brighter periods of international relations, but also in the periods when relations are strained—and conducted with persistence, foresight, firmness, and at the same time, with flexibility and initiative. In so doing, political figures should not think of exploiting those talks, and the nuclear problem in general, for their own

immediate political gains, but only for the long-term interests of their country and the world. And the planning of the talks should be included in one's general nuclear strategy as its most important part—on this point as well, I am in agreement with you.

And then he concludes the letter:

In conclusion, I again stress how important it is that the world realize the absolute inadmissibility of nuclear war, the collective suicide of mankind. It is impossible to win a nuclear war. What is necessary is to strive, systematically though carefully, for complete nuclear disarmament based on strategic parity in conventional weapons.

Why, then, do the Soviet authorities persecute Sakharov? Soviet statements about the importance of nuclear disarmament and the danger of nuclear war are in full agreement with those of Sakharov.

Soviet officials may disagree—as do many in the United States, among whom I include myself—with Sakharov's suggestion that the potential deployment of some MX missiles by the United States would contribute to the success of the arms negotiations. But this point, which I regret to say, the press, both East and West, blew out of all proportion relative to Sakharov's discussion of so many fundamental issues in his essay, hardly calls for abuse or outrage.

There is surely no disagreement on Sakharov's most basic point that the challenge to control nuclear weapons and to avert nuclear holocaust is the most pressing problem of international relations at this time.

Sakharov's strong humanitarian convictions, his compassion for the persecuted, his devotion to human dignity and the freedom of the human spirit have also led him to speak out forcefully and persistently in defense of human rights. He has risked everything in his courageous support of prisoners of conscience and his opposition to oppression wherever it occurs. Is this why the Soviet authorities persecute the Sakharovs? Is Soviet society not strong enough, and secure enough to tolerate the voice of Sakharov in its midst?

If this is indeed the case, then there is a simple solution to their difficulty: send the Sakharovs to us here in America. We will be honored to welcome this indomitable and courageous couple. I would be proud to welcome Andrei Sakharov as a scientific colleague at Stanford University, and many other major American universities have also offered him appointments.

Some Soviet spokesmen have argued that Sakharov's past involvement in their weapons programs would make it a risk to their security if he were allowed to emigrate to the West. I reject that argument.

I have for many years been involved with technical defense matters for the U.S. Government, and do not believe Soviet security could be harmed in the least, given the fact that Sakharov himself has not been active in defense work for more than 16 years.

I view Sakharov, as a living saint—constant in purpose, clear in vision, modest, and unflinching in courage. A beautiful tribute was paid to Sakharov by his compatriot and friend, the author Lev Kopelev, in his autobiographical memoir, "Ease My Sorrow," from which I quote:

* * * the majesty of his spirit, the power of his intellect, and the purity of his soul, his chivalrous courage and selfless kindness feed my faith in the future of Russia and mankind.

The Sakharovs have become citizens of the world, and those of us who value what they stand for must do all we can to save them.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman. That's the end of my prepared statement.

Chairman FASCELL. Thank you very much, Doctor. I certainly agree with the conclusion of your statement.

I'm just constantly amazed when I hear testimony about people such as the Sakharovs. I'm just constantly amazed that the Soviet leadership would deny themselves of the power of an intellect of this kind to serve some ideological purpose, which, in the long run, will be lost.

Dr. DRELL. Yes.

Chairman FASCELL. That's for sure.

Whereas, the power of the intellect, the contributions that he makes to science will never be lost.

Dr. DRELL. That's right.

Chairman FASCELL. And I don't understand the tradeoffs. I find it very hard. I know the Soviets are not illogical. But I must be missing something about Soviet mentality. And I notice that in Soviet treatment of other great people—with artists and writers.

Dr. DRELL. Yes.

Chairman FASCELL. And it seems as if they just want to destroy all the talent they really have.

Dr. DRELL. I agree it's quite puzzling that they don't realize it's in their self-interest to make full use of those talents, or, if they cannot accommodate them, send them to the rest of the world.

Chairman FASCELL. Yes.

Dr. DRELL. They would be admired if they did that.

Chairman FASCELL. Any questions from the panel?

Mr. Smith, do you want to ask any questions?

Mr. SMITH. First of all, I want to thank you for your fine statement, Doctor.

I have visited the Tokamak fusion plasma laboratory at Princeton, and can tell you, as you well know, and much better than I, that that is a tremendous technology. It's years away, and certainly Dr. Sakharov has made important contributions to that.

I do have one question relative to the current situation.

Dr. DRELL. Yes.

Mr. SMITH. In your opinion, why have the Soviet authorities allowed Mrs. Bonner to go to the West for medical treatment, I believe on at least two occasions, but now they refuse?

Dr. DRELL. I really don't understand. And I have pointed that out and have raised that question, too.

In the mid-1970's, actually, on three occasions she went to Italy for treatment for her very severe glaucoma. I believe it was three.

Mr. SMITH. Right.

Dr. DRELL. And why they now have chosen a different course, to me, is a puzzle. I regret it deeply.

I understand Andrei Sakharov's very deep commitment. I think if you look at the history of Andrei's career you'll find he's never asked for anything for himself. His hunger strikes, his protests

have always been for other deprived groups, other suffering groups, family members like his children, or the fiancee of his stepson. He's never asked for anything for himself. It's the consuming concern and love of his family and other people in trouble.

Mr. SMITH. I would be happy to yield.

Mr. RITTER. You know, I hate to be a wet blanket here, when the atmosphere is a kind of attempted hopefulness, but it does fit. Their denial of Elena Bonner's ability to seek medical treatment in the West, their repression of Sakharov does fit. It does fit the pattern that we have witnessed since 1979.

Dr. DRELL. Yes.

Mr. RITTER. And in the last year in particular there has been an increasing——

Dr. DRELL. Yes.

Mr. RITTER [continuing]. Pattern of intransigence——

Dr. DRELL. Yes.

Mr. RITTER. Hostility, lack of cooperation, seeking a kind of——

Dr. DRELL. Yes.

Mr. RITTER. Intense military solution to problems, or militaristic in any event.

Dr. DRELL. Yes.

Mr. RITTER. And I think it is cause for real concern here. I'd like your comment on that.

Dr. DRELL. They certainly have taken a harder line in recent years in dealing with dissidents.

One of the reasons I am happy to have an opportunity to make my statement this morning, I'm pleased that you are having these hearings, and I still have a sense that they, like every other society, do not look forward to being damned, or cursed by the world. And the power of public opinion, which was so important three years ago, in 1981, in the last hunger strike of the Sakharovs being terminated with Lisa Alexsyeva being allowed to come to the West to join her husband, I think shows that even in the gravest projection of what they do, no society wants to stand alone and wants to be hated.

It is a tragedy that over the last 3 or 4 years the relations between the Soviet Union and the United States have become more filled—filled with more strident rhetoric, and have become less accommodating.

In fact, we are two societies that have no choice but to get along with each other. We live in a world where these new nuclear weapons that they are building and that we are building are not increasing our security.

As President Eisenhower said, in 1956, we're talking about weapons of suicide——

Mr. RITTER. I submit——

Dr. DRELL [continuing]. That have no direct military value.

Mr. RITTER. Just a short comment——

Dr. DRELL. Excuse me.

Mr. RITTER. On your last comment, I submit that we, the United States of America, our institutions, and our Government are trying——

Dr. DRELL. Yes.

Mr. RITTER. Are trying far, far harder——

Dr. DRELL. Yes.

Mr. RITTER [continuing]. Than they are to come together. I think we have to recognize that, and we have to keep trying. There's no doubt about it. We can't give up.

But you have to wonder what kind of a society it is that awards an important medal to a pilot of a plane that shoots down an airliner with 269 civilians on it.

Dr. DRELL. Yes.

Mr. RITTER. The Sakharov repression is not out of line with that kind of action.

I yield back to my colleague.

Mr. SMITH. Doctor, I had one other question. Can you give us some kind of indication as to the effect that the newest incident, the newest crisis in the Soviet Union with the Sakharovs has on the scientific community with its relationship to the Soviet Academy of Sciences?

Dr. DRELL. I don't know officially what will happen. Let me repeat what the situation is. In 1980, when Andrei Sakharov was exiled to Gorky, our National Academy of Sciences, under the presidency of Dr. Philip Handler, canceled binational official meetings sponsored by the Academy. Individual exchanges went forth. Multinational exchanges went forth.

Mr. SMITH. I see.

Dr. DRELL. This was a step to show that this distinguished colleague and a foreign honorary member of our academy was being treated in an unacceptable way.

There were wide divergences of views in the scientific community. Science is a—the scientific community is a single community in the world. We're all studying the same nature. There is no Western and Eastern physics. The same laws of nature are there.

The notion of a simple boycott did not seem to be a logical one. It was felt that scientific exchange was important. It was an exchange of ideas. It was an exchange of understanding. It was an important line of communication.

But it was also felt that something had to be done through our academy to say you can't do that to one of the people that we respect and honor so much.

That was the formula proposed by Philip Handler.

In recent years, the academy has been exploring how—if it can devise more effective ways to both maintain scientific contact and, at the same time, honor this limited boycott.

What the National Academy is doing now, I don't know. I am a member. I did not attend the meeting this year. What Dr. Press has in mind, you'll have to ask him.

I do know that many of my colleagues will have a total revulsion for anything dealing with the Soviet scientific establishment if the Soviet system allows one of the Sakharovs to die.

I, myself, in my own personal contribution, got 36 colleagues, all members of the National Academy, 13 of them Nobel laureates, to send a telegram with me to President Chernenko on May 13, which was made public in a press conference in Washington last week. So, I won't read it here again, unless you want to see the statement. But I'll submit it to the record, saying that we have support-

ed the idea and we've worked for the idea of developing a community of scientists around the world.

But the death of one of the Sakharovs will have very severe and long-lasting damage to these efforts. Those are the words.

Chairman FASCELL. Without objection, the entire statement will be——

Dr. DRELL. Thank you.

Chairman FASCELL [continuing]. Included in the record. And we thank you very much.

[Following is the full text of telegram sent to President Chernenko:]

Telegram sent to President Konstantin Chernenko,
The Kremlin, Moscow, U. S. S. R.
on Sunday, May 13, 1984

We urge the Soviet government to grant permission to Dr. and Mrs. Sakharov to receive medical care of their choosing. At this present moment of grave threat to their health--with Dr. Andrei Sakharov entering his twelfth day of an open-ended hunger strike and with Mrs. Yelena Bonner-Sakharov in urgent need of treatment for heart disease--it is of vital importance that they have access to medical treatment in which they can have full confidence and peace of mind.

We are all scientists who believe in the importance of cooperation among scientists of different nations--and who have been working to realize the unity of the community of scientists around the world. It is our deep concern that, should the present crisis lead to the death of one of the Sakharovs, there will be very severe and long-lasting damage to efforts to maintain and to improve collaboration and cooperation with our Soviet colleagues.

A humanitarian act to save the Sakharovs--rather than the creation of new martyrs--is surely in the common interest of all concerned.

Signed by 36 members of the U.S. National Academy of Sciences (of which Andrei Sakharov is an Honorary Foreign Member), including 13 Nobel Laureates, and the Presidents of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences and the American Physical Society. The names of the signers are listed along with their research fields and academic institutions.

Dr. Paul Berg*	Biochemistry	Stanford University
Dr. Lipman Bers	Mathematics	Columbia University
Dr. Hans Bethe*	Physics	Cornell University
Dr. Kenneth Case	Physics	Rockefeller University
Dr. Sidney Drell	Physics	Stanford University
Dr. Mildred Dresselhaus	Physics/Electrical Engineering and President	M. I. T. American Physical Society
Dr. Herman Feshbach	Physics and President	M. I. T. American Academy of Arts and Sciences
Dr. Val Fitch*	Physics	Princeton University
Dr. Paul Flory*	Chemistry	Stanford University
Dr. Harold Furth	Physics	Director, Plasma Physics Laboratory Princeton University
Dr. Richard Garwin	Physics	IBM Thomas J. Watson Research Ctr
Dr. Theodore Geballe	Applied Physics	Stanford University
Dr. Sheldon Glashow*	Physics	Harvard University
Dr. Marvin Goldberger	Physics	President, California Institute of Technology
Dr. Robert Hofstadter*	Physics	Stanford University
Dr. Donald Kennedy	Biology	President, Stanford University
Dr. Arthur Kornberg*	Biochemistry	Stanford University
Dr. Alexander Leaf	Medicine	Harvard University
Dr. Joshua Lederberg*	Biology	Rockefeller University
Dr. Leon Lederman	Physics	Director, Fermilab
Dr. Francis Low	Physics	M. I. T.
Dr. Harden McConnell	Chemistry	Stanford University
Dr. Philip Morrison	Physics	M. I. T.
Dr. Wolfgang Panofsky	Physics	Stanford University
Dr. Edward Purcell*	Physics	Harvard University
Dr. I. I. Rabi*	Physics	Columbia University
Dr. Burton Richter*	Physics	Stanford University
Dr. Malvin Ruderman	Physics	Columbia University
Dr. Edwin Salpeter	Physics/Astronomy	Cornell University
Dr. Isadore Singer	Math/Physics	University of California, Berkeley
Dr. Henry Taube*	Chemistry	Stanford University
Dr. Sam Treiman	Physics	Princeton University
Dr. Victor Weisskopf	Physics	M. I. T.
Dr. Jerome Wiesner	Elec.Engineering	M. I. T.
Dr. Arthur Wightman	Math/Physics	Princeton University
Dr. Kenneth Wilson*	Physics	Cornell University

*Nobel Laureate

37-500 O—84——3

Mr. SMITH. One final question, now, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman FASCELL. Yes.

Mr. SMITH. Dr. Drell, I, too, have been to the Soviet Union. I've been to Moscow and Leningrad, and have met with several refuseniks and dissidents. And, unfortunately, never had the privilege of meeting with Dr. Sakharov and his wife.

But could you just share with us some of your reflections——

Dr. DRELL. Yes.

Mr. SMITH [continuing]. Having met with him, and just some insights on the man——

Dr. DRELL. Yes.

Mr. SMITH [continuing]. The person as a man?

Dr. DRELL. The most succinct way to say it is that the man is, to me, a living saint. There is a constancy of purpose, a braveness, a calm in his demeanor as he addresses these questions. You don't see rancor, you don't see anger at anyone. You see patience, but a commitment that's firm to an ideal that we all share, I believe.

Chairman FASCELL. A total scientific mind.

Dr. DRELL. Well, I like to think that good scientists have that kind of mind, but we're not always credited with it.

And, so—and his wife, I think, is just one of the strongest, bravest women I've ever met. I met with her a year ago in December, when I went to the Soviet Union. I was invited because of interest on the part of the Soviet Government's people in views that I had given in testimony before the Senate on arms control, how we might make progress in the START talks, which I think, if you don't mind my saying so, both countries, I think, could contribute a little more flexibility to.

But——

Chairman FASCELL. Yes; I think we could do a little bit more, too, Doctor, than we're doing.

Dr. DRELL. That's—well, I thank you for the remark because I believe so.

And I said I would come, but they had to understand that if I came there was no way I was going to go to Moscow and not visit my good friend Mrs. Sakharov, knowing that Andrei was in Gorky, and that was a closed city.

They never said anything more. I never said anything more. They invited me and I went and, indeed, spent a wonderful evening and listened to her talk about her concerns about Sakharov's health, her concerns about the increasing isolation and crackdown. It was very sad. It was humanly a most warm experience, but it was very sad.

Chairman FASCELL. Mr. Wirth.

Mr. WIRTH. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I'm glad you made that comment about who's trying to do what. I didn't want Dr. Drell, a distinguished scientist, to go away thinking that there wasn't some further analysis within the Congress of the efforts that have been made toward arms control.

Dr. DRELL. Yes.

Mr. WIRTH. And there are many of us who believe that the fault lies also very clearly on our side and that perhaps the only way in which we're going to make any progress is to eliminate this absurd administration from the White House in November, and that's the

way in which we might be able to make some progress on arms control, at least from our position.

I just wanted you to know that there is a different view than what might have been expressed a bit earlier.

Mr. SMITH. Would the gentleman yield on that?

Mr. WIRTH. Be happy to.

Mr. SMITH. You know, the gentleman is certainly entitled to his opinion.

Mr. WIRTH. Absolutely; no question about it.

Mr. SMITH. But those kinds of comments do nothing to the dialog between either the two parties, or the two countries.

Mr. WIRTH. I will reclaim my time.

Mr. SMITH. Well, you have that right.

Mr. WIRTH. And I wanted to in the—the gentleman from New Jersey had raised the question of the National Academy.

Dr. DRELL. Yes.

Mr. WIRTH. It seems to me that there is a real possibility that with the statement of the National Academy less than a month ago——

Dr. DRELL. Yes.

Mr. WIRTH [continuing]. That the academy wanted to open up further scientific relationships with the Soviets.

Dr. DRELL. Yes.

Mr. WIRTH. That, in fact, we're saying to the Soviets, that you can do whatever you want related to the Sakharovs with impunity. We're going to open up relationships in any case.

I—there's very little that we can do about that sort of thing.

Dr. DRELL. Yes.

Mr. WIRTH. But I would think you, as a very distinguished member of the academy, and the colleagues that signed the telegram that you released last week, you know, should be thinking about that.

I don't know what——

Dr. DRELL. I am thinking about that. I have expressed my views on it. I believe I'm correct. I don't feel comfortable defending things when I don't know all the facts. I don't want to be a defender or an attacker of the academy right now, because I don't know all the facts.

But I believe the intention was not to restore contacts that had been stopped by Handler, but to explore possible relations between the scientific establishments that might bring a better means of understanding the concerns and dealing with them.

Now, how it will work, I don't know. As I say, it depends upon how it's done. But I certainly have, and so have many, expressed concern that we not go back on the position taken by Dr. Handler and the academy 4 years ago.

Mr. WIRTH. I have enormous respect for Frank Press, and he knows what he's doing, and is very aware of all of this.

Dr. DRELL. Yes.

Mr. WIRTH. I believe, at the same time, that we're concerned about opening the door, at the same time we have to open the door.

Dr. DRELL. Yes.

Mr. WIRTH. Because it's not being done politically, I don't think, and that you have an obligation, I think, in the scientific community to do so.

Dr. DRELL. Yes.

Mr. WIRTH. We have an obligation in the artistic community.

Dr. DRELL. Yes.

Mr. WIRTH. We have an obligation in the political community to do so in every way possible, if our two governments seem to be as incapable as they are of talking to one another.

Dr. DRELL. There are two simple solutions to the problem, and they are both completely wrong in my view. One is to ignore what they're doing to our colleagues and go about business as normal in scientific exchanges.

Mr. WIRTH. That's right.

Dr. DRELL. And the other is to have a total boycott.

Mr. WIRTH. That's right.

Dr. DRELL. And where you draw the fuzzy line in between and how you do it so that you're comfortable with your conscience is one of these very difficult problems of the world.

Mr. WIRTH. Well, we live with that ambiguity.

Dr. DRELL. We live with the ambiguity whether we're scientists, or human beings. We certainly do.

Mr. WIRTH. Let me raise one other possibility with you, as well. It seems to me that, again, assuming that these two governments are as incapable as they are——

Dr. DRELL. Yes.

Mr. WIRTH [continuing]. Of communicating with one another, then perhaps what we should be doing is taking whatever steps possible to invoke third parties.

Dr. DRELL. Yes.

Mr. WIRTH. I was interested to note the announcement yesterday——

Dr. DRELL. Yes.

Mr. WIRTH [continuing]. That Mrs. Gandhi and a number of other world leaders had joined together and would be communicating with this administration and with the Soviets in an attempt to bring them back in to some communication.

It seems to me, perhaps the same sort of thing might be done related to the Sakharovs, as well.

Last week, a number of us sent communications to Mr. Chernenko on that, a group in the Congress——

Dr. DRELL. Yes.

Mr. WIRTH [continuing]. Running all the way from Bill Armstrong to Paul Tsongas. If one can define the world in those terms, I think one comes pretty close.

You know, a group like that, asking that, in fact, that be done.

Dr. DRELL. Right.

Mr. WIRTH. We tried to see if we could invoke third parties.

Dr. DRELL. I think that I'm not a very good strategist, because I really don't understand what will make the Soviet Union respond on this one, because I don't understand why, in the first place, they're acting so poorly from their own self-interest.

We have one datum. In 1981, on the last hunger strike, when the Sakharovs were reaching the critical point, at the end of 17 days, the Russians did allow Lisa to come to the West.

I think that all channels, political, scientific, public—we're stressing them to do this—played a role. I think that every channel, to explain to them that people they may respect, people they have to get along with, all sorts of people feel deeply about this issue, and that they will be scarring their name badly, if they allow something to happen to the Sakharovs, it's got to help. So, I think every channel should be used.

I hope now that this issue has become front page news it won't be quickly forgotten. One has to stay with it in a sustained and a continuing way.

Mr. WIRTH. Dr. Drell, we appreciate your being here and also your long and continuing involvement in these issues of human rights around the world. We've worked with you in the past, and really appreciate all of your support.

Thank you very much.

Dr. DRELL. Thank you very much.

Chairman FASCELL. Doctor, you should know that I wrote Dr. Press some time ago, questioning the appropriateness of continuing the official exchanges. I asked him to meet with me when he comes back, to see if we can't discuss it and try to arrive at some—what he considers and the scientific community considers—an appropriate response to indicate their feelings on this very important issue.

Dr. DRELL. I must say, given the breadth of concern that's been expressed to me and the support in almost no time for the telegram I sent, I find it inconceivable that if something happens to the Sakharovs that the scientific exchange won't very seriously suffer. I'll be——

Chairman FASCELL. I'm tempted, also, since we've got a real expert on the stand, to go into the question of radioactivity, and fallout, and the inappropriateness of that kind of instrument in terms of warfare.

Dr. DRELL. Yes.

Chairman FASCELL. But I'm going to have to leave that for another time.

Dr. DRELL. Ok.

Chairman FASCELL. What we want to do here is try to be helpful on the record for the Sakharovs.

Dr. DRELL. Yes.

Chairman FASCELL. And I know my colleagues are a little bit upset and want to say something that they think was a little bit partisan. And I'm going to give them a short time to respond, but very briefly, to say whatever they want to say to defend the President and the Republican Party.

Mr. RITTER. The chairman has a way of making things humorous in a very pleasant fashion.

Chairman FASCELL. Well, if we didn't have that, we'd be in sad shape.

Mr. RITTER. I agree. I agree.

You know, I, frankly, am taking my time, as my colleagues have taken theirs, I have great respect for the gentleman from Colorado. I've worked with him on several committees.

But I regret that he is engaged in a partisan attack. But I am sadder more about the underpinnings of the attack. The underpinnings of his attack are, basically, that the United States and the Soviet Union are like mirror images of one another, that somehow if something happens and we can't control the Soviet side, it must be our fault because we're just about the same, and it takes two to tango. I submit that that is a grave error.

In terms of arms control, very briefly, the MX was a child of three administrations. The Carter administration sought a racetrack basing mode near the gentleman's own state that was unacceptable. Pershing and Cruise have been accepted by several administrations, and a conservative West German Chancellor, a Social Democrat, a Mitterrand, and a Giscard D'Estaing, a Thatcher, and before her a Labor Prime Minister.

I submit that the United States is not at fault for the shooting down of an airliner with civilians on it. I submit that because we didn't rein in our own private groups over the Soviet's presence at the Olympics that we are not at fault for their pullout. I think the people understand that.

I submit that the United States is not at fault for the Soviet's treatment of Andrei Sakharov and that we are not at fault when four lonely activists, on behalf of a people's peace movement in the Soviet Union, are arrested. And our peace movement here—and colleagues like the gentleman from Colorado agree that our peace movement is a free peace movement, and that we have tremendous freedom of debate and discussion here and that there's virtually none in the Soviet Union.

And that is part of what makes us so different. It shows that the administrations of Chernenko and Andropov, and the KGB's role in Soviet society make our society light-years different.

And, you know, we are trying. But surrender, unilateral nuclear disarmament is not the answer. As Les Aspin, a gentleman from Wisconsin, said so eloquently on the floor, and in his editorials, and in his "Dear Colleague," unilaterally halting a program as important as the MX rewards the Soviets for their intransigence.

I didn't say it. The President didn't say it. The gentleman from Colorado's colleague in the Democratic Party said it.

And, you know, I would hope that we could debate this issue in concrete terms rather than in a partisan attack.

Chairman FASCELL. Well, I think—

Mr. RITTER. It's not in the spirit of these discussions.

Chairman FASCELL. Well, I didn't understand the gentleman's remarks to equate the Soviet Union with the United States, and I didn't understand him to advocate unilateral disarmament either.

Mr. RITTER. No, I didn't say he—

Chairman FASCELL. I can't get too upset. I think, if the Soviets get an opportunity to listen to this discussion, I hope they realize that this is what we're talking about when we talk about freedom of expression in the United States, as compared to the Soviet Union. And this is an election year, and everybody in both parties is a little sensitive.

We have our own views. And the gentleman from Colorado, I know, is very able to defend himself at anytime, anywhere.

Mr. RITTER. Sure.

Chairman FASCELL. And I would like to end this right now, if I could.

Mr. WIRTH. If I might, Mr. Chairman, only to—if I might have a minute.

I have great—is that all right?

Chairman FASCELL. Yes.

Mr. WIRTH. I have great respect for my colleague from Pennsylvania.

Chairman FASCELL. What you said took 30 seconds. And it took him 5 minutes to respond. Now, how long is it going to take you?

Mr. WIRTH. As the gentleman—less than a minute.

Chairman FASCELL. Ok, all right.

Mr. WIRTH. As the gentleman from Pennsylvania well knows, nobody is suggesting that the United States shot down a Korean airliner, or its equivalent.

The only point is that we are in a very, very brutal situation between the two superpowers who for each—for separate reasons are not talking to the other.

It is absolutely ridiculous to be in that kind of a situation when there are 50,000 nuclear warheads on the face of this earth.

We are in the process of building nine new weapons systems, 17,000 more nuclear warheads, when the concept of nuclear war would suggest to us, you know, assuming that it is valid, and I would suspect that it is, that 100 cities being blown up is enough to trigger nuclear war and destroy the globe.

Now, 100 nuclear—100 cities can be blown up by one Trident submarine. Now, it seems to me that from our own perspective, just looking at the health of the world and the survival of the human race, that it would be incumbent upon this administration to sit down with the Soviets, just as it is incumbent upon the Soviets to sit down with this administration.

And we ought to do everything that we possibly can to pressure them to do that, just as we are here to pressure the Soviets to think more rationally about the fate of the Sakharovs, than they appear to be doing now.

The two are related. Of course they're related. There's no question about it. I think there is fault on both sides. I think there is fault on the Soviet's side. And I would hope that the gentleman from Pennsylvania and I would be able to get together, as we have across the aisle on so many other issues, and on this issue as well, to do what we can to pressure this administration, or be it the Carter administration, which was not able to get SALT II passed, which should have been passed, in my opinion. should have been confirmed by the Senate, to get that done.

Mr. RITTER. Would the gentleman yield on the substance?

Mr. WIRTH. Now, there is no——

Mr. RITTER. Would the gentleman——

Mr. WIRTH [continuing]. Limit to absurdity——

Chairman FASCELL. I'm sorry.

Mr. WIRTH [continuing]. In any administration in dealing with nuclear armament.

Mr. RITTER. This is on the substance.

Chairman FASCELL. Because I say so right now, and this is going to go on for hours, and I don't want it to go on for hours.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. Chairman.

Chairman FASCELL. We can continue the debate on this subject at another time. I hope for a Solomon-like closing statement from Dr. Drell, and then let's go on.

We've got three other witnesses. You gentlemen can take your pique out on the floor, or somewhere else.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. Chairman, this is very important I think. I'd appreciate the opportunity because it's relevant to the testimony. I'd appreciate the chairman's indulgence.

Mr. Wirth indicated that we should pressure the administration. I assume that he also feels we should pressure the Soviets.

As he well knows, Dr. Sakharov himself has said that using weapons systems and even, perhaps, using linkage, as the Aspin amendment did, to arms-control treaties is a way of putting some pressure, substantive pressure, on the Soviets to come back to the bargaining table.

It should be clearly understood that it was not the United States that walked out of that arms-control meeting. It was the Soviet Union, and it was not us. I think that has to be underscored, exclamation point.

Chairman FASCELL. Dr. Drell.

Dr. DRELL. I would attempt a Solomon-like statement.

Chairman FASCELL. If you can just attempt to conclude this discussion.

Dr. DRELL. It is clear that there is a vast difference between the Soviet and the American societies. And we are thankful, we are grateful for all the advantages we enjoy relative to theirs.

It's also clear that we both have to make, in spite of these differences, the most intense, the most flexible, the most good-willed and serious efforts for arms negotiations, as Sakharov has said.

And since the issue of the connection between human rights and arms control has come up, let me just close with a statement made by Sakharov, in 1975, I believe it was. He was standing outside in Vilna picketing on behalf of a friend of his, an ill biologist, who was on trial while his wife was receiving his Nobel Peace Prize in Oslo.

And Andrei Sakharov said, at that time, and I'm quoting: "It is absolutely unacceptable, even for a goal as important as respect for human rights, to make conduct in that area a precondition for disarmament negotiations. Disarmament must have first priority."

Thank you.

Chairman FASCELL. Pretty strong statement, Dr. Drell.

Thank you very much.

Our next witnesses are Sergei Batovrin and Valery Godyak. Come forward, gentlemen. We're delighted to have you.

Mr. Batovrin is a member of the unofficial Soviet peace group known as the Group to Promote Trust Between the United States and the U.S.S.R.—or the trust group for short. He's an artist who emigrated to the United States in June 1983. He's now a resident of New York City. He works on behalf of the trust group in the U.S.S.R. by speaking to numerous groups in the United States, Canada, and Western Europe.

Mr. Godyak is a physicist, a member of the European Physical Society, and another activist in the Moscow trust group. After his

emigration from the Soviet Union in February this year, he's resumed his activities as a scientist and also speaks on behalf of the Soviet trust group.

And, gentlemen, we're delighted to welcome you here and to hear your statement. And Mr. John Finerty of the Commission staff will help us with the translation.

Mr. FINERTY. If anything comes up that I'm needed, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman FASCELL. Ok, thank you.

Mr. BATOVRIN. In June 1982, in the city of Moscow, the Group for the Establishment of Trust Between the U.S.S.R. and the U.S.A. proclaimed its establishment, which lays the foundation for the independent peace movement in the U.S.S.R.

The Moscow trust group felt that if the search for the means to reach disarmament were not to remain a fruitless exercise in good intentions, it would have to be accompanied by a search for trust and mutual openness in all those spheres of life in which the West and East might come in contact.

The trust group came out in favor of overcoming mistrust and for humanizing relations by means of free exchange of information, unofficial contacts on all levels through discussions and dialog. The group called for the widespread participation of average citizens in the dialog between politicians of the West and East.

From June 1982 until the present, the members of the independent peace movement in the U.S.S.R. have been experiencing continuing persecution, detentions, interrogations, psychological terror, searches, official warnings, slander in the press, beatings, house arrests, round-the-clock surveillance, dismissal from work, arrests, incarceration in psychiatric hospitals, judicial reprisals, sentences, imprisonment in jails and camps.

Today, about 2,000 persons participate in the activities of the independent peace group in the U.S.S.R.

The difficulties experienced by the independent peace movement in the Soviet Union—which these average citizens of a nuclear superpower have voluntarily and consciously taken upon their shoulders—clearly illustrates the systematic and flagrant violations by the Soviet Union of the Helsinki accords and of its other international obligations.

The U.S.S.R. does not approve of the right of citizens to form peace groups and organizations independent of the government, and it attempts to impede their creation by illegal and repressive measures.

For example, on July 14, 1982, in Tyumen oblast, Aleksandr Shatravka and Vladimir Mishchenko were arrested for their efforts to organize a Siberian branch of the trust group. At the time of their arrest, they had been trying to obtain signatures from Siberian workers for the group's main declaration, an appeal to the governments and peoples of the U.S.S.R. and U.S.A.

Shatravka and Mishchenko were kept in psychiatric hospitals for 6 months, and then they were sent to the infamous Serbsky Institute of Forensic Psychiatry to establish their mental fitness to stand trial. Having been declared mentally competent, Shatravka and Mishchenko were then moved to an ordinary prison where they suffered frequent beatings by prison administrators.

On April 26, 1983, a hearing on this case was convened in the village of Sovetsky in Tyumen oblast. The court and a specially empaneled commission of political experts examined the trust group's documents that had been seized from Shatravka and Mishchenko. This document was simple and direct. It expressed the opinion that the widescale discussion and debate on the disarmament question can contribute to the cause of arms reductions.

The document further stated that the establishment of mutual trust is a necessary precondition for disarmament and that such mutual trust can be created by means of broad participation of the public in the official East-West dialog, exchanges of information on disarmament issues, humanitarian gestures, public discussion of disarmament problems, and the establishment of an international nongovernmental organization to take up disarmament issues.

Shatravka and Mishchenko were charged under article 190 of the RSFSR Criminal Code with "spreading knowingly false fabrications that slander the Soviet state and society".

In effect, the court's indictment means that in the Soviet Union the very idea of a peace movement independent of the government is a serious crime punishable by law.

In its final verdict the court declared, "An appeal to Soviet society over the heads of the party and the government, which regard that pursuit of peace as the essence of Soviet foreign policy, is slanderous."

Shatravka and Mishchenko, the two "slanderers" who tried to form an independent peace organization, were sentenced to 3 years in prison and 1 year in a hard labor camp.

Chairman FASCELL. Let me interrupt you right there to say that if we were to apply the same rule in this country our jails would be full.

Mr. BATOVRIN. Yes.

In April 1983, Vladimir Kornev, the founder of the Odessa Trust Group, was arrested. The details of his trial are not known. It is known, however, that he is serving time in a correctional labor camp. His wife Vera was arrested in September.

The U.S.S.R. refuses to acknowledge the right of private citizens to distribute information on disarmament questions and uses illegal and repressive measures to hamper the dissemination of such information.

For example, on February 18, 1983, KGB functionaries blocked a photo exhibit devoted to the antinuclear movement in the West. The KGB cordoned off the building where the exhibit had been set up and rudely stopped Western correspondents at the entrance of the building who were trying to visit the exhibit.

Vladimir Fleishgakker, the exhibit's organizer, was arrested as he left the building. He was subsequently tried and sentenced to 15 days in jail on phony charges of "minor hooliganism." While in jail, Fleishgakker was deprived of food, water and sometimes sleep.

In January 1983, Ludmilla Doronina was arrested in Riga, the capital of the Latvian Republic. She was charged with possession and distribution of disarmament documents issued by the trust group. Doronina was found guilty under article 70 of the U.S.S.R. Criminal Code—"anti-Soviet agitation and propaganda"—and sentenced to 5 years in labor camps and 3 years in exile.

The KGB repeatedly impeded press conferences called by the group, refused to allow the group to publish its peace proposals, and rudely interfered with Western correspondents trying to attend the group's press conferences.

A commission of political experts prepared a report that was presented during the trial of Aleksandr Shatravka and Vladimir Mishchenko in April 1983. Among other things, that report asserted that the trust group's proposal for establishing an international bulletin for the exchange of East-West opinion on disarmament issues was "tantamount to an intent to reveal Soviet military information to a potential aggressor."

The court accepted the experts' report as an aggravating factor in the trial.

The fact is that the U.S.S.R. refuses to acknowledge the right of private citizens to hold public meetings and gatherings on disarmament issues. The Government regularly uses illegal and repressive measures to halt such meetings.

For example, at the beginning of June 1982, the Moscow Trust Group addressed a letter to the Moscow City Soviet Council requesting permission to hold a demonstration on June 27, devoted to the theme "Hiroshima, Never Again." On June 27, the KGB placed under house arrest some 50 members and supporters of the trust group so as to prevent the demonstration.

The KGB repeatedly and systematically prevented the trust group from holding meetings and seminars by placing its members under arrest and preventing visitors from seeing them.

On June 1, 1983, 200 members of the Group of Good Will, a new peace group, were detained in Moscow while attempting to rally for an antinuclear demonstration in Tsaritsino Park.

The U.S.S.R. hinders dialog between citizens of the East and West, and thus prevents their efforts to unite behind the international disarmament cause.

In July 1982, at a time when an international delegation of Western peace activists was in Moscow, all members of the trust group were prevented from meeting with the delegation. All the group's members had either been placed under house arrest or otherwise had been prevented from seeing the international delegation.

Yuri Medvedkov and Yuri Khronopulo were arrested and sentenced to 15 days in jail on trumped up charges.

For the second year now, the group's telephones remain disconnected and mail is not being delivered to group members.

The Soviet mass media regularly try to slander the group in the eyes of Western peace activists. For example, see the Tass article by Yury Kornilov, November 1982, or the Literary Gazette article by V. Lushin, December 1982.

Pravda commentator Yury Zhukov regularly denounces the Group in press releases.

The U.S.S.R. does not acknowlege the right of private citizens to express their opinions on disarmament questions, and it applies harsh measures against the independent supporters of peace.

On October 26, 1982, Oleg Radzinsky, an activist in the Trust Group was arrested. Radzinsky is the originator of many of the group's proposals.

After many months of persecution, that included losing his job and being dismissed from Moscow State University, round-the-clock surveillance, interrogations, and searches, Radzinsky was arrested. His arrest came at a time when he was in especially poor health, suffering from an open ulcer, asthma, cholecystitis, and spinal problems.

He was charged on the basis of trumped up allegations of engaging in "anti-Soviet agitation and propaganda." Radzinsky's trial was held on October 13, 1983. He was sentenced to 1 year in prison and 5 years of exile.

Neither his mother, nor his friends, nor members of the group were allowed inside the courtroom during the trial. In fact, seven members of the group were detained during the trial, and Olga Medvedkova was badly beaten up by the KGB during the detainment.

At the present time, Radzinsky is serving his exile in Tyumen Oblast in Siberia, where he has been placed in a hospital due to the serious nature of his health problems. But he didn't get any medical help.

Mark Reitman, an activist in the Trust Group who is engaged in peace research, has been systematically subjected to torture. Reitman suffers from diabetes, and he must eat at least every 3 hours, or he will go into shock and possibly lapse into a coma and die.

Knowing Reitman's medical history, KGB agents have detained him some eight times for up to 5 hours at a time while refusing to allow him to eat. This has caused horrible suffering and gradual poisoning of Reitman's organs. At the present time, Mark Reitman is in extremely poor health and his life is clearly in danger.

On October 13, 1983, during Radzinsky's trial, Olga Medvedkova was illegally detained and badly beaten by KGB agents stationed at the 103d Militia Department in Moscow. On December 8, 1983, Olga Medvedkova was arrested. She was cynically charged with having assaulted two militiamen during her detention in October.

In March 1984, Olga Medvedkova was tried by the Moscow District Court. Although her defense attorney decisively proved the trumped up nature of the documents upon which the indictment against her was based, and despite the absence of testimony from prosecution witnesses, Olga Medvedkova was found guilty and sentenced to 2½ years in a prison camp. As a result of massive pressure on Soviet authorities from Western antinuclear organizations, however, the sentence was suspended.

In 1983, in Novosibirsk, Aleksandr Vorona, who is disabled, was arrested for having disseminated the peace proposals of the Trust Group. He was placed in psychiatric hospitals, where he has been subjected to involuntary treatment with nerve depressants. Previously, the 32-year-old peace activist had spent 9 years in a special psychiatric hospital on political charges. Today, his life is in danger.

In December 1982, in Moscow, Yuri Popov and Sergei Troyansky were forcibly incarcerated in psychiatric hospitals. They have been active in the pacifist youth group called the Independent Initiative. Yuri Popov is in the Fourteenth Psychiatric Hospital in Moscow. Both are being subjected to involuntary treatment, including intensive sulfazine shock therapy. From the moment of its inception, 12

members of the Independent Initiative Group have been arrested and are presently in psychiatric hospitals and camps.

Here we have presented only a few examples of the experiences of the independent peace movement in the U.S.S.R.

We call upon the signatory states of the Helsinki accords to demand answers from the U.S.S.R. to the issues raised by the persecution of independent peace activists in the U.S.S.R., to condemn this cruel practice, and to take practical measures which would remind the U.S.S.R. of its responsibilities in the face of its international obligations.

Chairman FASCELL. Thank you very much. And, without objection, we'll include your full statement in the record.

[Following is the full written statement of Sergei Batovrin and Valery Godyak:]

TESTIMONY ON
THE SITUATION OF UNOFFICIAL PEACE GROUPS
IN THE USSR

Before the Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe

May 22, 1984

By Sergei Batovrin and Valery Godyak,
Members of the Group to Promote Trust
Between the U.S. and the USSR

In June 1982, in the city of Moscow, the Group for the Establishment of Trust Between the USSR and the USA proclaimed its establishment, which lay the foundation for the independent peace movement in the USSR.

The Moscow Trust Group felt that if the search for the means to reach disarmament were not to remain a fruitless exercise in good intentions, it would have to be accompanied by a search for trust and mutual openness in all those spheres of life in which the West and East might come in contact. The Trust Group came out in favor of overcoming mistrust and for "humanizing" relations by means of free exchange of information, unofficial contacts on all levels, through discussions, and dialogue. The group called for the widespread participation of average citizens in the dialogue between politicians of the West and East.

From June 1982 until the present, the members of the independent peace movement in the USSR have been experiencing continuing persecution, detentions, interrogations, psychological terror, searches, official warnings, slander in the press, beatings, house arrests, round-the-clock surveillance, dismissal from work, arrests, incarceration in psychiatric hospitals, judicial reprisals, sentences, imprisonment in jails and camps.

Today, about 2,000 persons participate in the activities of the independent peace group in the USSR.

The difficulties experienced by the independent peace movement in the Soviet Union -- which these average citizens of a nuclear superpower have voluntarily and consciously taken upon their shoulders -- clearly illustrates the systematic and flagrant violations by the Soviet Union of the Helsinki Accords and of its other international obligations.

The USSR does not approve of the right of citizens to form peace groups and organizations independent of the government, and it attempts to impede their creation by illegal and repressive measures. For example:

a. On June 9, 1982, only one week after the announcement of the establishment of the Group of Trust, its founding members -- Sergei Batovrin, Vladimir Fleishgakker, Sergei Rozenoer, Igor Sobkov, Mikhail Ostrovsky, Gennady Krochik, Boris Kollyuzhnii, Viktor Blok, Yury Khronopulo -- were detained by the KGB. They were taken to a district office of the Moscow public prosecutor where the prosecutor gave each person an official warning that the peace group was "illegal." Such peace activities, they were told, are "anti-society, anti-social, and provocatory," and if continued these activites would result in criminal prosecution under Article 200 of the Criminal Code of the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic (RSFSR). Article 200 reads as follows: "Arrogation (samoupravstvo). Arrogation, that is, unwarranted exercise in violation of the legally established order, of one's actual or supposed right, causing substantial harm to citizens or to

state or social organizations, shall be punished by correctional tasks for a term not exceeding six months, or by a fine not exceeding fifty rubles, or by social censure, or shall entail application of measures of social pressure."

b. Despite the fact that the Criminal Code of the USSR does not even provide for such a measure, Sergei Rozenoer, Sergei Batovrin and Vladimir Fleishgakker were placed under house arrest on June 12, 1982. Batovrin's arrest lasted a month, Rozenoer's two weeks, and Fleishgakker's three weeks. During the period of house arrest, the prisoners were forcibly confined to an apartment. That apartment was guarded twnety-four hours a day by up to as many as 50 KGB officers who detained and questioned visitors trying to interview the detainees. Various forms of psychological intimidation were used. Batovrin was subjected to 16 exhausting interrogations. For a months his wife and young daughter were not allowed to enter the apartment, and his mother was threatened. Fleishgakker even received a death threat, and his wife was not allowed to enter the apartment where the Group members were being confined.

Rozenoer was repeatedly subjected to tiring interrogations. Each of the prisoners was intimidated with threats to their families. The KGB demanded that the prisoners leave the Group. Having decided that their ploy was not having its intended effect, the KGB lifted the house arrest and soon began resorting to harsher repressive measures against the Group.

c. On July 14, 1982 in Tyumen oblast (province) Aleksandr Shatravka and Vladimir Mishchenko were arrested for their efforts to organize a Siberian branch of the Group of Trust. At the time of their arrest they had been trying to obtain signatures from Siberian workers for the Group's main declaration: An appeal to the Governments and Peoples of the USSR and USA. Shatravka and Mishchenko were kept in psychiatric hospitals for some six months and then they were sent to the infamous Serbsky Institute of Forensic Psychiatry to establish their mental fitness to stand trial. Having been declared mentally competent, Shatravka and Mishchenko were then moved to an ordinary prison where they suffered frequent beatings by prison administrators.

On April 26, 1983, a hearing on this case was convened in the village of Sovetsky in Tyumen oblast. The court and a specially empaneled commission of political experts examined the Trust Group's documents that had been seized from Shatravka and Mishchenko. The document was simple and direct. It expressed the opinion that the widescale discussion and debate on the disarmament question can contribute to the cause of arms reductions. The document further stated that the establishment of mutual trust is a necessary precondition for disarmament and that such mutual trust can be created by means of broad participation of the public in the official East-West dialogue, exchanges of information on disarmament issues, humanitarian gestures, public discussion of disarmament problems, and the establishment of an international non-governmental organization to take up disarmament issues.

37-500 O—84——5

Shatravka and Mishchenko were charged under Article 190 of the Criminal Code of the RSFSR with "spreading knowingly false fabrications that slander the Soviet state and society." In effect, the court's indictment means that in the Soviet Union the very idea of a peace movement independent of the government is a serious crime punishable by law. In its final verdict the court declared that "an appeal to Soviet society over the heads of the Party and the Government, which regard the pursuit of peace as the essence of Soviet foreign policy, is slanderous." Shatravka and Mishchenko, the two "slanderers" who tried to form an independent peace organization, were sentenced to three years in prison and one year in a hard-labor camp.

d. In April 1983, Vladimir Kornev, the founder of the Odessa Trust Group, was arrested. The details of his trial are not known. It is known, however, that he is serving time in a correctional labor camp. His wife Vera was arrested in September.

The USSR refuses to acknowledge the right of private citizens to distribute information on disarmament questions and uses illegal and repressive measures to hamper the dissemination of such information. For example:

a. On August 5, 1982 the Trust Group organized an art exhibition entitled "The World: Alarm and Hope" that was devoted to the memory of the victims of Hiroshima. The KGB got wind of the exhibit, prevented it from opening, and seized the paintings on display. Sergei Batovrin, an artist, presented 88

of his own works for the Hiroshima exhibit. The KGB seized all of his paintings on the pretext of conducting an investigation in connection with the case of another Group member, Oleg Radzinsky. Later, when Radzinsky was brought to trial, Batovrin's paintings were not introduced as evidence, and they were never returned to their rightful owner. This confiscation of private property was illegal, and the authorities still refuse to return the paintings.

On August 6, 1982, Batovrin himself was arrested by the KGB and taken by force to Psychiatric Hospital No. 14. There he was subjected to psychological terror, repeated interrogation, and he was forced to take large doses of the drugs galoperidol and khlorproteksen. A month later he was freed as a result of pressure brought by Western peace organizations.

Also in August another member of the Trust Group, Valery Godyak, was detained by the KGB and forced to submit to psychiatric examination at a local police station.

b. In July 1982, the KGB conducted eight searches in apartments of V. Godyak, Yu. Medvedkov, I. Sapiro, E. Illina, V. Rozin and O. Radzinsky, all of whom are members or supporters of the Trust Group. The KGB confiscated materials on disarmament, peace proposals and other documents prepared by the Group, typewriters used for preparing these materials, and lists of supporters who distributed the Group's proposals.

c. In June 1982, after the Trust Group had announced plans for "The International Peace Line" (international telephone

calls to discuss questions and answers on disarmament issues), the telephones of all Group members were disconnected. Their telephones remain disconnected today.

d. On February 18, 1983, KGB functionaries blocked a photo exhibit devoted to the anti-nuclear movement in the West. The KGb cordoned off the building where the exhibit had been set up and rudely stopped Western correspondents at the entrance of the building who were trying to visit the exhibit. Vladimir Fleishgakker, the exhibit's organizer, was arrested as he left the building. He was subsequently tried and sentenced to 15 days in jail on phony charges of "minor hooliganism." While in jail, Fleishgakker was deprived of food, water and sleep.

e. In January 1983, L. Doronina was arrested in Riga, the capital of the Latvian Republic. She was charged with possession and distribution of disarmament documents issued by the Trust Group. Doronina was found guilty under Article 70 of the USSR Criminal Code ("anti-Soviet agitation and propaganda") and sentenced to five years in labor camp and three years in exile.

f. The KGB repeatedly impeded press conferences called by the Group, refused to allow the Group to publish its peace proposals, and rudely interfered with Western correspondents trying to attend the Group's press conferences.

g. A commission of political experts prepared a report that was presented during the trial of Aleksandr Shatravka and Vladimir Mishchenko in April 1983. Among other things, that report asserted that the Trust Group's proposal for establishing

an international bulletin for the exchange of East-West opinion on disarmament issues was "tantamount to an intent to reveal Soviet military information to a potential aggressor." The court accepted the experts' report as an aggravating factor in the trial.

h. Valdimir Brodsky, a cardiologist, has been compiling documents addressed to the medical consequences of a nuclear war. Since the beginning of May 1983, Brodsky has been repeatedly threatened by the KGB with the possibility of having fabricated criminal charges brought against him by the KGB's criminal investigation department. Since Brodsky until recently worked in an intensive care unit where a large number of deaths can be normally expected, the KGB suggested that Brodsky might be charged with responsibility for such deaths.

i. The KGB systematically stops seminars on disarmament organized by the Trust Group.

The fact is that the USSR refuses to acknowledge the right of private citizens to hold public meetings and gatherings on disarmament issues. The government regularly uses illegal and repressive measures to halt such meetings. For example:

a. At the beginning of June 1982, the Moscow Trust Group addressed a letter to the Moscow City Soviet (council), requesting permission to hold a demonstration on 27 June devoted to the theme "Hiroshima--Never Again." On the 27th, KGB placed under house arrest some 50 members and supporters of the Trust Group so as to prevent the demonstration. Two

truckloads of soldiers were stationed outside Sergei Batovrin's apartment -- an additional measure of intimidation since he had been under house arrest for three weeks.

b. The KGB repeatedly and systematically prevented the Trust Group from holding meetings and seminars by placing its members under arrest and preventing visitors from seeing them.

c. On February 19, 1983, Sergei Rozenoer and Sergei Batovrin started a hunger strike to protest KGB harassment and particularly the refusal of permission to hold an anti-nuclear rally. This hunger strike, which was the only form of protest that remained available to the Group in view of official suppression, lasted 32 days.

d. On September 16, 1983, Sergei Rozenoer was arrested. The Trust Group had planned to hold a literary reading and discussion devoted to the theme of peace and disarmament that very same day in Rozenoer's apartment. Rozenoer was tried on phony charges and sentenced to 15 days in jail.

e. On September 29, Vladimir Fleishgakker was arrested. The Trust Group has been planning to hold an international seminar-discussion in Fleishgakker's apartment that same day. Fleishgakker was convicted on the basis of phony allegations and sentenced to 15 days in jail.

f. On June 1, 1983, 200 members of the Group of Good Will -- a new peace group -- were detained in Moscow while attempting to rally for an anti-nuclear demonstration in Tsaritsino Park.

The USSR hinders dialogue between citizens of the East and West and thus prevents their efforts to unite behind the international disarmament cause. For example:

a. In July 1982, at a time when an international delegation of Western peace activists was in Moscow, all members of the Trust Group were prevented from meeting with the delegation. All the Group's members had either been placed under house arrest or otherwise had been prevented from seeing the international delegation. Yury Medvedkov and Yury Khronopulo were arrested and sentenced to 15 days in jail on trumped up charges.

b. The KGB frequently prevents visiting members of Western peace organizations from going to the homes of Group members. Western peace activists are surveilled, questioned and searched at the airport.

c. The KGB repeatedly prevented the Trust Group from protesting against the arrests of British peace campaigners at Greenham Common. The Group prepared a letter on this subject and secured advance agreement from the British Embassy to accept the letter and forward it to London. In June 1983, however, members of the Group were arrested three times as they tried to deliver the letter. Then, after alternative means of delivering the letter were found, members of the Group were arrested four times as they tried to enter the British Embassy to receive a reply to their letter from Prime Minister Thatcher.

d. For the second year now, the Group's telephones remain disconnected, and mail is not being delivered to Group members.

e. The Soviet mass media regularly try to slander the Group in the eyes of Western peace activists. For examples, see articles written for TASS by Yu. Kornilov (November 1982) and for "Literary Gazette" by V. Lushin (December 1982). "Pravda" commentator Yury Zhukov regularly denounces the Group in press releases.

f. The Group was libeled in the political experts' report submitted to the court during the trial of Shatravka and Mishchenko. That report concluded that the goal of the Trust Group was: "to undermine the authority of the Soviet state and its leaders in the eyes of those same international powers that are evaluated by Soviet leaders as BEING ACTUALLY QUITE USEFUL as an effective reserve in the anti-imperialistic and anti-militaristic ideological struggle."

The USSR does not acknowledge the right of private citizens to express their opinions on disarmament questions, and it applies harsh measures against the independent supporters of peace.

a. On October 26, 1982, Oleg Radzinsky, an activist in the Trust Group, was arrested. Radzinsky is the originator of many of the Group's proposals. After many months of persecution that included losing his job and being dismissed from Moscow State University, round-the-clock surveillance, interrogations and searches, Radzinsky was arrested. His arrest came at a time when he was in especially poor health, suffering from an open ulcer, asthma, cholecystitis and spinal problems. He was

charged on the basis of trumped up allegations of engaging in "anti-Soviet agitation and propaganda." Radzinsky's trial was held on October 13, 1983. He was sentenced to one year in prison and five years of exile. Neither his mother, nor his friends, nor members of the Group were allowed inside the courtroom during the trial. In fact, seven members of the Group were detained during the trial, and Olga Medvedkova was beaten up badly by the KGB during the detainment. At the present time, Radzinsky is serving his exile in Tyumen oblast (province) in Siberia, where he has been placed in a hospital due to the serious nature of his health problems.

b. Mark Reitman, an activist in the Trust Group who is engaged in peace research, has been systematically subjected to torture. Reitman suffers from diabetes, and he must eat at least every three hours or he will go into shock and possibly lapse into a coma and die. Knowing Reitman's medical history, KGB agents have detained him some eight times for up to five hours at a time while refusing to allow him to eat. This has caused horrible suffering and gradual poisoning of Reitman's organs. At the present time, Mark Reitman is in extremely poor health and his life is clearly in danger.

c. On October 13, 1983, during Radzinsky's trial, Olga Medvedkova was illegally detained and badly beaten by KGB agents stationed at the 103rd Militia Department in Moscow. On December 8, 1983, Olga Medvedkova was arrested. She was cynically charged with having assaulted two militiamen during her detention in October.

37-500 O—84——6

In March 1984, Olga Medvedkova was tried by the Moscow District Court. Although her defense attorney decisively proved the trumped up nature of the documents upon which the indictment against her was based -- and despite the absence of testimony from prosecution witnesses -- Olga Medvedkova was found guilty and sentenced to two and a half years camp. As a result of massive pressure on Soviet authorities from Western anti-nuclear organizations, however, the sentence was suspended.

In 1983, in Novosibirsk, Aleksandr Vorona, who is disabled, was arrested for having disseminated the peace proposals of the Trust Group. He was placed in a psychiatric hospital, where he has been subjected to involuntary treatment with nerve depressants. Previously, the 32-year-old peace activist had spent nine years in a special psychiatric hospital on political charges. Today, his life is in danger.

In December 1982, in Moscow, Yuri Popov and Sergei Troyansky were forcibly incarcerated in psychiatric hospitals. They have been active in the pacifist youth group called "The Independent Initiative." Yuri Popov is in the 14th Psychiatric Hospital. Both are beingh subjected to involuntary treatment, including intensive sulfazine shock therapy. From the moment of its inception, twelve members of the Independent Initiative Group have been arrested and are presently in psychiatric hospitals and camps.

Here we have presented only a few examples of the experiences of the independent peace movement in the USSR.

We call upon the signatory states of the Helsinki Accords to demand answers from the USSR to the issues raised by the persecution of independent peace activists in the USSR, to condemn this cruel practice and to take practical measures which would remind the USSR of its responsibility in the face of its international obligations.

New York — Sergei Batovrin

May 1984 — Valery Godyak

Chairman FASCELL. I want to thank you for your statement, which is a very depressing recitation of harassment and brutality, just because people want to speak the truth.

Does Mr. Godyak want to add anything at this point?

Mr. FINERTY. Mr. Godyak said that he would like to answer any questions that you may have.

Chairman FASCELL. All right.

Mr. Ritter?

Mr. RITTER. I thank the chairman.

And I have another engagement. I'm going to have to leave, but I wish my colleague from Colorado had stayed around to witness your testimony, which is so important, so essential for the American peace movement to be aware of. Not that they necessarily have to change their stand, but they have to see the differences between what's happening in the peace movement in this country and our ability to exert pressure on our Government, and what's happening in the peace movement in the Soviet Union, the real people's peace movement in the Soviet Union.

[Whereupon, Mr. Ritter made a statement in Russian.]

Mr. RITTER. I have to leave. But what you are saying is so important, I wonder where the TV cameras are.

If you were here to criticize our administration and our Government, the TV cameras would be all over this room.

Thank God there's one wonderful American newspaper that is here covering this today. I hope there are some others. I know that our voices are here, the Voice of America, Radio Free Europe.

What you are saying is very, very important and I hope—I wish you luck in getting your message across to the American people. It will help your movement in the Soviet Union and it will help our movement in the United States.

And I thank the chairman for yielding to me.

Chairman FASCELL. Mr. Smith.

Mr. SMITH. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I want to thank you for your excellent statement, as well as your your excellent English. An excellent job explaining.

Having read over your testimony and then hearing you explain some of it here this morning, I am struck by the naked hypocrisy

of the Soviet Union in claiming that it wants disarmament, claiming that it wants a nuclear freeze, claiming that it wants mutual trust. Here we have a peace group of some 2,000-odd people calling for such a dialog, and they are accused of committing high crimes. I share with you the concern that we need to invoke the Helsinki accords, to do everything we can to bring this before every forum.

Again, I thank the chairman for doing it here today.

I do have a couple of questions. The first, can you tell us what kinds of contacts you have established with the peace movement in the West, in order to share your story and what is going on in the Soviet Union?

Mr. BATOVRIN. Since we believe that it is very important for rank and file citizens of East and West to make a dialog, right from the very beginning of our independent peace activity we found all sorts of links and contacts with independent groups in the West. Sometimes we have some differences because not many people in the West realize that the problems of peace and human rights are inseparable. We believe that naivete about the nature of the Soviet society is rather natural because people live in an absolutely different world. They can hardly realize what is happening in the Soviet Union.

We know that the peace movement in the West is getting more and more realistic about the nature of the Soviet society. Dozens of organizations are demonstrating in front of the Soviet embassies and calling for dismantling SS-20's, and for the support of independent peace activists in the Soviet Union, and for stopping the harassment of the independent activists in the Soviet Union.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. Batovrin, have you been asked at all to be a speaker, or to address any of the rallies for the——

Mr. BATOVRIN. Yes; we are speaking all the time. Just recently we came back from Canada, where we took part in many public meetings. And we're speaking in the United States, and Canada, in Europe. We are traveling all of the time.

Mr. SMITH. Of the 2,000 members, if I understand that correctly, how many cities in the Soviet Union have an activist peace group?

Mr. BATOVRIN. We believe that right now there are activists of our movement in 16 cities of the Soviet Union. As well, there are nine groups. But it's extremely difficult to give the exact number of the activists because we don't have a formal membership because of the difficulties we have in our peace activities. So, this number is approximate.

Mr. SMITH. I see.

I would just conclude, Mr. Chairman, that again we see that catchall crime, "anti-Soviet agitation and propaganda" being used as it is used against all kinds of dissidents and human rights activists. And, now, again, it is being applied to the peace movement.

So, I commend you for your fine work and thank you for being here today.

Mr. BATOVRIN. Thank you.

Chairman FASCELL. Thank you very much, gentlemen. We appreciate your appearance here today, making this contribution to the record based on your own experiences and your observations. Thank you very much.

Our next witness is Dr. Boria Sax, who is a New York-based writer, lecturer, and researcher. He has written articles on the East European human rights situation for various organizations, including the New York Helsinki Watch. He has also written on the development of the unofficial peace movements since their inception, particularly that of East Germany.

Dr. Sax, you have a prepared statement which we will be happy to put in the record. You may read it, or you may proceed extemporaneously, whichever suits you.

Dr. SAX. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. It is an honor to be here.

I have submitted a somewhat detailed chronology of the peace movements in Eastern Europe for publication in the record. Today, however, I would like to speak of them, primarily, in somewhat more general terms.

During the 1980's, for the first time, small groups of citizens throughout Eastern Europe have been organizing independently to work for disarmament in both East and West. They have taken some inspiration from peace activists in the West, while guarding their independence. They have, for the most part, preferred not to be identified as dissidents. They have expressed concern about the intransigence of countries in both NATO and the Warsaw Pact.

Nevertheless, in terms of organization, they bear little resemblance to any Western political groups. Working under legal systems that severely restrict freedom of expression and prevent them from organizing openly, they have managed to prosper by maintaining a degree of decentralization which is difficult for most of us to imagine.

Though these groups do, indeed, probably express feelings and ideas which are shared by broad segments of the population in their countries, the word "movement" is not entirely appropriate.

Small clusters of activists, throughout the region, who are denied access to the mass media, must communicate through samizdat and by word of mouth.

Their initiatives, such as demonstrations and petitions, are coordinated only through an informal organizational network. They manifest few of the organizational characteristics which we are accustomed to expect from mass movements in the West.

One finds neither the centralized leadership nor the elaborately constructed coalitions among interest groups. These differences are also reflected in the tone of the statements which emanate from the East European peace movements.

Perhaps the greatest priority has been to facilitate discussions on the issue of peace, both among themselves and with their counterparts in the West. A word which is used repeatedly in their statement is the word "dialog."

A discussion has been carried on, frequently with the use of pseudonyms, in samizdat publications and sometimes in the pages of smaller Western journals.

While Western political groups of all persuasions produce manifestos and position papers, that—though often, in fact, composed with considerable doubt and hesitation—tend to be dogmatic in tone, Eastern Europeans tend to speak somewhat more personally. They value the exchange at least as much as the conclusions which

it may produce. They value the discussion itself in addition to the statements which are expressed.

I wish to emphasize here that I am speaking only of the independent peace movements, not of the Government-sponsored peace councils of the Soviet bloc. The latter organizations constantly invoke the cause of peace in their rhetoric, but their protests are exclusively against the armaments of the other side. They hold what they call peace demonstrations, but the speakers are all party officials.

In an article published in the July 9, 1983, issue of "The Nation," Czech activist Milan Simecka has written, and I quote:

> Our young people would gladly march hundreds of miles for peace if it would assure them a future free of fears and nightmares. Plenty of our people are aware of the devastation that threatens the entire globe. Still, whenever those people feel they ought to do something about it, they are quickly discouraged by the way contributions of the so-called peace fund are extorted from them every payday for ostentatious dinners for ostentatious dignitaries at peace congresses in ostentatious palaces. They come to think of peace as just another worthy cause to which everyone must contribute like the Revolutionary Trade Union, or the boss's birthday party.

I would like now to summarize some of the major initiatives which have been undertaken by independent peace movements in Eastern Europe. I will not speak of the Soviet Union, because this has already been so well covered here today.

In Czechoslovakia, the human rights organization Charter 77 has, in the last year or so, switched from being an organization exclusively devoted to human rights and has issued a number of papers on such subjects as disarmament. They have carried on a dialog both within the country and with certain Western peace groups as well. In addition, following the announcement of the counterdeployment of Soviet missiles on Czech territory, a number of petitions have been circulated in schools and factories protesting this deployment.

Charter 77, just in the last few days, issued a statement in which they explained that they do not want to be considered a peace group. They do, however, simultaneously reiterate their desire to continue a dialog on the subject.

In Hungary, a group called the Peace Group for Dialog was founded in 1982. Working in the country of Eastern Europe which has the greatest freedom of speech, they had initially anticipated more cooperation from the authorities than they were, in fact, able to achieve.

They were initially working on the fringes of the offical Peace Council. In July 1983, they organized a peace camp in which various members of their groups and various Hungarian citzens were to meet with representatives of E.N.D. and other peace groups throughout Western Europe and the United States. The camp was broken up by police, and most of the visitors were deported. A number of representatives of the Peace Group for Dialog were arrested and briefly interrogated.

The group decided to disband 3 days later. However, many of the members continue their activities in a more decentralized and therefore less vulnerable fashion. Recently, Rabbi Csenyi has founded an independent Jewish peace group in Budapest.

The GDR has by far the largest and also the most decentralized of these various independent peace movements. They have managed to hold numerous demonstrations in most major cities of the GDR, at times involving as many as 500 people. They have also issued several petitions. Each of these demonstrations and petitions is a story unto itself.

The one group, however, which has managed to emerge from the elaborate network of strictly local groups and operate on a national scale is Women for Peace, founded in October of 1982, by 300 women who signed a petition to head of state, Erich Honecker, protesting against the new legislation which extended the draft to women under certain conditions.

Two of their representatives, Baerbel Bohley and Ulrike Poppe were arrested in late 1983. However, they were released after about a month, after heavy protests from peace groups both within the country and in the West.

The GDR peace movement has managed to survive in a large part because it has existed under the umbrella of the Lutheran Church, which has, on many occasions, allowed the peace activists the use of their facilities and endorsed a number of their positions at regional synods.

In Poland, just recently a new group called KOS, a committee for social resistance, has also participated in this ongoing dialog within the region by issuing a few statements on the subject of disarmament.

Today, our minds are very much on Andrei Sakharov, one of the most courageous and influential activists in the world today, who has undertaken a hunger strike. And I would like to close with a brief remark about Mr. Sakharov.

Should he die, activists in East and West will, of course, feel great sorrow, but they will also have to search their hearts carefully in analyzing the resulting situation and deciding what conclusions to draw.

Independent peace groups and individuals in Eastern Europe will try to make themselves heard in this, as in any other crisis. Should the Sakharovs either die or else be not only placed in eternal exile, but actually in prison, statements published first in samizdat will no doubt reach the West. And I hope that after people have taken such effort and risked their careers and even risked their lives to issue them, I will hope that these statements will not be ignored.

Thank you.

[Following is the full written statement of Dr. Sax:]

Written Statement By
Dr. Boria Sax

PEACE MOVEMENTS IN EASTERN EUROPE: AN OVERVIEW

This decade has already seen the emergence of unofficial peace movements in the Soviet Union, East Germany, Hungary, Czechoslovakia, and perhaps other countries in Eastern Europe as well. The existence of such a phenomenon adds strength and credibility to the appeals of Western peace groups, whether these are addressed to their own governments or to those of nations in the Soviet Bloc. Thus when the Green Party in West Germany protested the arrest of East German peace activists Bärbel Bohley and Ulrike Poppe in a letter to head of state Erich Honecker, they could, with some plausibility, claim to speak in the name of the "international peace movement."

It is moving for us in the West to see citizens of Eastern Europe concerned about the missiles pointed in our direction as well as those pointed at themselves, sufficiently concerned to risk, in many cases, their freedom and careers. Nevertheless, it is difficult to say how much solidarity with the East European peace movements is possible at this stage. These movements are united with one another--and with their counterparts in the West--by a shared concern about the escalating arms race. Apart from this, they have little real cohesion. It is even questionable whether they developments in question should properly be

called "movements" at all. Over the past three or four years a number of isolated demonstrations, petitions, and declarations have been made public, all broadly centered on the theme of disarmament in both East and West. These originate in comparatively small groups of people. No one of these initiatives would, of itself, be large enough to command a great deal of attention. Taken together, however, they suggest a significant trend within East European society.

The sort of organizational structures which, however, we identify with mass movements in the West are absent. The peace movements in Eastern Europe employ neither the centralized leadership nor the elaborate coalitions which we are accustomed to expect. Clusters of peace activists are joined only by an informal organizational network. In societies where the mass media are strictly controlled by the state and mail is censored, communication among such groups must frequently be by word of mouth. What coordination exists is undertaken with considerable caution, sometimes in secret.

Those involved in East European peace movements are starting to conduct a dialogue not only with their Western counterparts but among themselves as well. There are naturally considerable differences from country to country, as well as within every nation. These debates are sometimes carried out in the pages of smaller Western journals or in samizdat. Perhaps the most frequently argued topic is the connection between peace and

human rights. It is generally accepted that there is an ultimate bond between the two, that one will not be fully achieved independently of the other. The question is to what extent they should be linked at present. East European peace activists obviously require at least a certain amount of freedom of speech in order to carry on any sort of credible dialogue. Nevertheless, some fear that the emphasis on human rights could place them in opposition to their governments and lead to increased international tension.

A second, closely related topic of debate for East European peace movements is the proper relationship with official campaigns for peace, generally sponsored by affiliates of the Soviet World Peace Council. In a statement published in The Nation (July 16, 1983), Czechoslovak activist Milan Simecka wrote: "Our young people would gladly march hundreds of miles for peace if it would assure them a future free of fears and nightmares. Plenty of our people are aware of the devastation that threatens the entire globe. Still, whenever those people feel they ought to do something about it, they are quickly discouraged by the way contributions to the peace fund are extorted from them each payday for ostentatious dinners for ostentatious dignitaries at peace congresses in ostentatious palaces. They come to think of peace as just another worthy cause to which everyone must contribute, like the Revolutionary Trade Union or the boss's birthday party."

The problem of relating to official peace committees in Eastern Europe has also divided activists in the West. Such committees sometimes appear as a sort of parody of Western peace movements. They employ similar slogans and similar rhetoric. They use much the same symbols, the dove for example. They also hold marches and demonstrations, but the people on the podium are party officials and the protests are only against the armaments on the other side. A few peace activists in the West are so naive as to accept such demonstrations at face value. A larger number feel they at least manifest a sincere desire for peace, however distorted its expression might be. They wish to maintain contact with official peace committees, hoping that these committees could eventually provide the forum in which a real dialogue could develop. Others believe that the official peace committees serve only to corrupt legitimate peace movements and that all contact with them should be avoided.

With such considerations in mind, I would like to make a brief survey of the groups and initiatives that have emerged in various East European countries. In the Soviet Union, a small independent peace movement has consisted primarily of young professionals in their twenties. Unlike dissidents such as Sakharov and Solzhenitsyn, the Soviet peace activists do not place themselves in opposition to the Soviet state. Their basic goal has been to seek a greater understanding among the people in East and West, in the hope that this would eventually filter up to their governments.

On June 4, 1982 Sergei Batovrin and ten other citizens from the Moscow area announced the formation of an independent organization called the "Group to Establish Trust between the USSR and the USA" at a press conference to which both Soviet and foreign journalists were invited. The group met twice weekly over the next half year and issued several proposals for disarmament and cultural exchange. Affiliated groups were formed in Odessa, Novosibirsk, and Leningrad.

Within a week after the Moscow group was founded, eight of the original eleven members received warnings from the Moscow authorities that their activities were illegal. Members suffered increasing harassment over the next several months. They were interrogated and had their homes searched by the police. Some were dismissed from their jobs. In August of 1982, Batovrin was arrested and confined to a psychiatric hospital. He was released in 1983 and emigrated to the United States where he continues to work for a dialogue between the superpowers. The "Group to Establish Trust" has not issued any public statements since May of 1983 and its current status is not certain.

The unofficial peace movement in East Germany is by for the largest to have emerged in the Soviet Bloc. It is also the most decentralized. Over the past three years or so, small groups of people have undertaken innumerable initiatives in support of disarmament in both East and West. The movement has centered primarily on support to an alternative to conscription. Opposition to military education in the schools and, most recently, the deployment of Soviet missiles on East German soil have also played

a role. The movement has enjoyed considerable support from the churches, the only large organizations that are not directly under the control of the Communist Party.

Exceptionally strict laws restricting freedom of expression and association have prevented East German activists from organizing openly. It is amazing how much the peace movement in East Germany has managed to accomplish without any centralized organization, access to the mass media, or even a charismatic leader. Working within an informal confederation of groups which communicate primarily through word of mouth, peace activists have staged several demonstrations in East Berlin, Leipzig, Dresden, Halle, Cottbus, Jena, and other cities. This development is a spontaneous mass movement in the truest sense of the words.

The one organization of more than local proportions to have emerged so far from the network of smaller groups is "Women for Peace," founded in October of 1982 in protest against legislation which extended the draft to women in the event of a national emergency. Approximately 300 women signed a letter of protest to head of state Erich Honecker. Branches of "Women for Peace" were organized in Dresden, Halle, and East Berlin, at which members met regularly to exchange ideas. They cultivated contacts with other peace groups, both in the GDR and abroad. With the announcement that Soviet missiles would be deployed in the GDR, a crackdown against East German peace activists began. Two leaders of "Women for Peace," Bärbel Bohley and Ulrike Poppe, had their

homes searched and were arrested and placed in investigative detention. After widespread protests, however, in both East and West, the two women were released without formal charges being made.

Smaller, though potentially significant peace movements have emerged in Hungary and Czechoslovakia. An independent Hungarian group known as the "Peace Group for Dialogue" was formed in September 1982. The organization initially used the premises of the official Hungarian Peace Council for their meetings and repeatedly emphasized their unwillingness to do anything that would bring them into conflict with the law. Operating within the East European country reputed to have the greatest freedom of expression, they had anticipated more cooperation from the government than they were able to attain. As the group began to develop foreign contacts, their members encountered increasing police harassment.

In the summer of 1983 the "Peace Group for Dialogue" organized a camp at which the cause of peace was to be discussed with representatives of various Western organizations. On July 6 the camp was broken up by police and most of the Western visitors were deported. Three days later the "Peace Group for Dialogue" voted to disband. Many former members, however, continue their activities in a more decentralized and therefore less vulnerable manner.

The major focal point of the Czechoslovakian peace movement has been the organization Charter 77, formed in 1977 by

240 of the country's leading intellectuals. Initially concerned primarily with more fundamental issues of human rights, the organization has broadened its concerns in the eighties to include questions of war and peace, which are considered to be intimately linked to human rights. (Several Charter 77 documents which discuss this linkage are appended to this written statement.) Members of the organization have proclaimed their solidarity with the unofficial East German peace movement and have cultivated a dialogue with Western thinkers and activists.

Charter 77 represents, above all, an intellectual elite that was displaced after the Soviet invasion in 1968. Since the stationing of Soviet nuclear missiles in Czechoslovakia, the protests have been taken up by a new generation. Workers have refused to make the normally routine gesture of signing a petition in support of government policy. Letters of protest have been written and sent to the editors of official newspapers. Leaflets and petitions have been circulated in schools and workplaces to protest against the deployment.

As of yet, the peace movement does not appear to have extended to Poland, where the opposition to the government is preoccupied with more immediate issues of human and civil rights. Independent peace movements have also not come to public attention in Yugoslavia, Romania, Bulgaria, or Albania, although it is possible that they may develop in the future, if they do not already exist, in one or more of the countries.

Selective Bibliography

Autonomous peace movements in Eastern Europe have so far received only limited attention from the Western press. The few journals that have reported on it consistently are published primarily in Great Britain. The most thorough of these is probably Labour Focus on Eastern Europe. Index on Censorship covers human rights issues that are intimately linked with these movements, though it is not directly concerned with questions of peace. Among American journals, Telos is notable for its penetrating debates about the Eastern European peace movements. It contains, however, little actual reporting. Nuclear Times has covered these movements regularly if not in great detail. Brief articles about the movements also appear occasionally in the New York Times and the Christian Science Monitor. As the oldest and largest of the autonomous peace movements, the development in East German has received most attention. Articles about it include "The East German Peace Movement" by Boris Sax, published in the Winter 1982 issue of Cross Currents, and "The Eastern Front" by Adam Hochschild in the September/October 1982 issue of Mother Jones.

A number of books and pamphlets have appeared in English that deal with the peace movements in individual Eastern European countries. Among them are the following:

Amnesty International. The "Group to Establish Trust between the USSR and the USA": its Imprisoned Members and Supporters. London: Amensty International, 1983.

Kavan, Jan and Zdena Tomin. Voices from Prague: Documents on Czechoslovakia and the Peace Movement. London: Palach Press, 1983.

Köszegi, Ferenc and E. P. Thompson. The New Hungarian Peace Movement. London: European Nuclear Disarmament, n.d.

Sandford, John. The Sword and the Ploughshare: Autonomous Peace Initiatives in East Germany. London: Merlin Press, 1982.

Chairman FASCELL. Thank you very much, Dr. Sax.

The Commission certainly will not ignore any statements that we receive in that fashion. We are anxious to receive them, and happy to translate and disseminate them to the best of our ability.

Dr. SAX. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman FASCELL. And I want to thank you very much for your comments on Dr. Sakharov and his contribution to peace in the world and for your overview about the independent peace movements and groups in Eastern Europe.

And I have some questions I want to ask you. One is, does the same kind of harassment take place in the Eastern bloc countries with respect to individuals and the independent peace groups that is being taken in the Soviet Union?

Dr. SAX. The same kind of harassment certainly takes place. The degree, however, varies greatly from country to country.

In Czechoslovakia, it is now comparatively severe. In Poland the regime is also very strict. Hungary, as I mentioned, has relatively more freedom of speech than any of these countries. And the GDR, or East Germany, is some place in the middle.

Chairman FASCELL. In your opinion, is there a clear understanding in the Eastern bloc countries about the difference between the official government sponsored peace councils and the independent peace groups?

Dr. SAX. Well, I don't think that most citizens, at this point, within these countries are really aware of the existence of the independent peace groups. I think that those who are aware of their existence—the growing number who are aware—do understand the distinction.

One source of confusion is the way the Western peace movements tend to be reported in the Soviet's media. They tend to be reported as if they were strictly comparable to the demonstrations of the official peace groups in the Eastern European countries. They tend to be reported as if these demonstrations were in fact directed exclusively against the armaments of NATO, as of course, is not the case.

And while a number of citizens are shrewd enough to realize that this reporting is slanted, nevertheless, there are some very widespread misconceptions.

Chairman FASCELL. Do you think the Soviets are taking advantage of the independent peace movement in this country by relating it to the official peace councils proposed and supported by the Soviet bloc?

Dr. SAX. Well, I think they are definitely trying. I think that most, though not all, participants in the independent peace movements in this country are quite able to distinguish between the official peace councils and the independent peace movement there.

Chairman FASCELL. Do you think that's one of the important things that we should undertake in this country, to be sure that people understand the difference between the government-sponsored peace councils of the Soviet bloc and the independent peace groups?

Dr. SAX. Well, I think that most people in this country are not, at this point, even aware of the existence of the independent peace movements within those countries. I think that as they become

aware that these independent peace movements exist they probably will have no trouble distinguishing between the two.

Chairman FASCELL. Are any of the Soviet peace council representatives now in the West anywhere, in the United States, for example?

Dr. SAX. Well, certainly representatives of them are in the West. There are groups like the Committee for Friendship Between the U.S. and the GDR, which, more or less, represents the official peace councils within this country, and puts out publications which employ a sort of rhetoric very similar to that used by many peace groups in the United States, but which presents the cause of the peace as synonymous with the cause of socialism as they conceive it.

Chairman FASCELL. There was quite an activity with respect to the deployment in Europe of the Pershing and cruise missiles in response to the deployment of the SS-20. Was there any activity in the independent peace groups that was critical of the deployment of the SS-20's to your judgment or knowledge?

Dr. SAX. Yes, there was quite a bit, as I mentioned, in Czechoslovakia. As you may know, when the governments took this step, its petitions were passed around in schools and factories asking the various citizens who are employed there, or who are connected with these institutions to sign to indicate their support. And generally, this is a more or less routine matter because it is simply expected that people will sign. However, in Czechoslovakia and in Hungary, in a number of factories, workers have refused to sign the petitions and, in fact, circulated counterpetitions of their own. In the GDR several hundred peace activists have been arrested in the last 5 months, or so, in protests against the Soviet deployment.

Chairman FASCELL. So, one way to determine the difference between independent peace movements in the East and government-sponsored councils would be to note that government-sponsored councils undoubtedly never have been critical of the deployment of the SS-20.

Dr. SAX. Absolutely.

Chairman FASCELL. Their criticism is directed simply at the West and the deployment of the Pershing and the cruise missiles?

Dr. SAX. Yes, that's entirely accurate.

Chairman FASCELL. Whereas the independent peace movement and the individuals are more balanced in their view about the desire for peace——

Dr. SAX. Yes.

Chairman FASCELL [continuing]. And have been critical of the deployment of SS-20's, as well.

Dr. SAX. Yes, most definitely.

I think in most countries it is very plain. It is not at all difficult to distinguish between the independent peace movement and the official peace councils. The only possible exception would be in Hungary, where a number of sort of semiofficial peace activists have conducted their activities at various times on the fringes of the peace council, groups that exercise a little independence but not a great deal. And there the distinction between the two is somewhat finer.

Chairman FASCELL. Well, would you say that it would be fair that we would have to caution the leaders of the peace movement in the United States and in the West to be very careful that in their zeal they just simply do not accept the propaganda line of the government-sponsored peace councils that emanate from the East?

Dr. SAX. Yes, I think so. And I think that the people who are best qualified to caution them about this are, in fact, the independent peace movements themselves.

A number of the Western European peace movements that had been somewhat uncritical of the Soviet Union have become more critical simply because of pressure from their Eastern European counterparts. These are people who the Western peace activists will listen to, as they, in many cases, will not listen to people who are representatives of this Government, or Western European governments.

Chairman FASCELL. Mr. Smith.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. Chairman, first of all, I'd like to commend you on that line of questioning and Dr. Sax for his answers. I think it greatly contributes to the dialog we're having here. This leads to a question that I have.

How well informed are the leaders of the independent peace movements in the Eastern bloc countries?

Dr. SAX. Surprisingly, they seem to be remarkably well informed, considering the restrictions under which they must operate. A lot of publications to which they are not supposed to have access, according to the Government, do somehow manage to reach them, are smuggled into the country. And the statements which they issue and the conversations that I have conducted with them indicate that they do, in fact, have a surprisingly very thorough knowledge of the issues.

Mr. SMITH. One other question. You indicated in your testimony that the Lutheran Church in—I forget the country——

Dr. SAX. The GDR, or Eastern Germany.

Mr. SMITH. Yes, in Eastern Germany—has provided some cover, for want of a better word, for the peace movement.

Dr. SAX. Support.

Mr. SMITH. "Support", better word.

My question is really this, it is my understanding that in most of the satellite nations, and certainly in the Soviet Union itself, with the notable exception of Poland, that the churches are subject to the ministry of religions, or some similar designation. How, in Eastern Germany, does the Lutheran Church not then become part of the Government, which is the case in most of the other nations?

Dr. SAX. Well, the Lutheran Church in East Germany, the churches, also, to an extent, the Catholic Church in East Germany have managed to avoid this because they are comparatively independent.

In most of these other countries, in Hungary, in Czechoslovakia, and so on, a substantial part of the minister's salary is paid by the Government. In the GDR, or East Germany, this is not the case.

In the GDR the Lutheran Church has far more autonomy than the churches in any other country of the Eastern bloc. They are allowed to operate their own schools to train people for careers within the church. They operate such institutions as hospitals.

They even have their own presses, which, of course, are subject to Government licensing, but which are, nevertheless, somewhat independent.

There is really no parallel in any other country of the Eastern bloc. The Government allows this, in part, because they look to the church to sort of mediate between them and both internal and external critics of the regime, and to help them by providing some channels for discontent that could otherwise lead to a much more amorphous and much more dangerous sort of explosion.

However, it is conceivable that the privileges currently enjoyed by these churches could be threatened by the support which they have lent to the independent peace movements.

Mr. SMITH. Ed, I would just like to commend Dr. Sax for providing that warning that the Western peace movement not be unwittingly used by the Soviet propagandists, that they be very careful and proceed with caution. And I again appreciate your comments.

Chairman FASCELL. Mr. Markey.

Mr. MARKEY. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. At this time, I ask that my written statement be submitted in full.

[Following is Representative Markey's written statement:]

STATEMENT OF THE HON. EDWARD J. MARKEY
BEFORE THE
COMMISSION ON SECURITY AND COOPERATION IN EUROPE
HEARING ON SOVIET AND EASTERN EUROPEAN PEACE MOVEMENTS

May 22, 1984

Mr. Chairman, thank you for the opportunity to address the Commission on the very important issue of official repression of those peace movements in the Soviet Union and in Eastern Europe that are independent of government or party control. I applaud the Commission under your able and sensitive leadership, Mr. Chairman, in bringing this issue to the forefront of human rights concerns.

On November 18, 1984, I and several colleagues of the House of Representatives, including yourself Mr. Chairman, introduced H.Con.Res. 236, on behalf of the Soviet peace movement. To date, 92 representatives have signalled their desire to cosponsor this legislation. The resolution expresses Congressional support for the right of independent Soviet peace groups to express freely their views and to organize and meet within the Soviet Union. Further, the resolution calls on the Soviet government to honor its international human rights commitments and to stop harassing members of the group.

The founding of the Moscow independent peace group, formally called the Group for the Establishment of Trust between the U.S.S.R. and the U.S.A., was announced at a press conference in Moscow on June 4, 1982. Foreign correspondents were invited to attend in person and to act as witnesses for the inauguration of this new venture. The initial membership consisted of the following people:

Sergei Batovrin -- a witness here this morning, Mr. Batovrin, was a refusenik painter and spokesperson for the group, who had been in conflict with Soviet authorities when they closed down an unofficial art exhibit that he had organized;

Vladimir Fleishgakker, a refusenik engineer;

Maria Fleishgakker, also a refusenik engineer, who had been previously detained for staging protests;

Sergei Blok, a physicist;

Sergei Rozenoer, a refusenik mathematician;

Mikhail Ostrovbsky, a refusenik linguist;

Igor Sobkov, a psychiatrist;

Gennady Krochik, a physicist; and

Boris Kalyuzhny, a mathematician.

All original members of the group lived in or near the city of Moscow.

The group collected 40 signatures for its founding declaration. Its stated goal was to start a 4-way dialog among the governments and the peoples of both the Soviet Union and the United States. The group's declaration intended to establish initial contacts with the independent peace movements in the German Democratic Republic and in Hungary, and also with the peace movement in the United States. The group members stressed that they were not dissidents and that their goals were consistent with the declared goals of the Soviet Government. They said that if they were persecuted in any way, such action would most probably be the result of a misunderstanding rather than genuine antagonism by either side.

On June 8, 1982, the group appealed to the Governments of the Soviet Union and the United States to cease nuclear testing and to increase contacts between the citizens of their respective countries. They submitted a detailed list of proposals in this regard, and sent an appeal to the Moscow City Council asking that Moscow be declared a nuclear-free zone. As an example of their openness, the group's members publicized their home telephone numbers inviting people to call them if they had any other suggestions.

Between June 11 and 17, 1982, however, all those who had called the press conference were detained, questioned, and warned by Soviet authorities that their actions were seen as a provocation directed against Soviet society and a violation of Soviet law. The home telephones of group members were disconnected, and their apartments were picketed by police and agents who prevented people from entering or leaving. Yet, the founders of the group had from the beginning made it clear that their goal was identical with the proclaimed goal of the Soviet Union -- namely, the preservation of peace. Their intention was not to oppose the official Soviet peace apparatus, but rather to work alongside it. As tragically typical, the Soviet Government responded to this expression of individuality and nonconformity by taking incredibly severe steps to crush the small group, similar to using a sledge hammer to stop a housefly.

The Soviet Government claims that it has an official peace movement with more than 80 million members. The modest independent peace group was repeatedly warned, however, to end its activities. Although they have not criticized Soviet foreign policy, the group's activists have been accused, in a deliberate provocation, of rendering assistance to anti-Soviet propaganda.

Tragically, the Soviet Government has engaged in organized harassment of this group, prohibiting meetings, confiscating materials, and threatening members. Peace group activists imprisoned or exiled, in addition to Mr. Batovrin and Mr. Godyak, include: Oleg Radzinsky, Aleksandr Shatravka, Vladimir Mishchenko and Vladimir Kornev.

More recently, Olga Medvedkova, who was three months pregnant at the time of her trial for "harassing" a militiaman in the performance of his duties, received a suspended two and one-half year sentence. Vladimir Gershuni was charged with "anti-Soviet slander" on April 12, 1983, found "nonaccountable", and sent for forcible psychiatric treatment in a special psychiatric hospital in Alma-Ata. Similarly, Aleksandr Vorona was forcibly confined to the Dnepropetrovsk Special Psychiatric Hospital for an indefinite term.

We should be proud that American people are free to speak out against the nuclear arms race, as the nuclear freeze movement has done. People in all countries should have this same freedom. The resolution, contained in H.Con.Res. 236, along with this hearing today will register congressional protest and call world attention to the Soviet Government's blatant disregard for the basic human right to search for peace.

Have these groups been at all critical of, you know, the SS-20 deployment?

Dr. SAX. Yes. They have been quite critical, to an extent. The earlier missiles were simply accepted, however, as a fact of life, something that they didn't like but which they were prepared to live with.

Mr. MARKEY. So they did not criticize that earlier?

Dr. SAX. Well, they did criticize it. But the criticism was less intense than the criticism of the counterdeployment that is going on now. That has provoked some very widespread protests and demonstrations in which several people have been arrested.

Mr. MARKEY. Do they support the nuclear freeze?

Dr. SAX. It varies considerably. There is a very wide range of opinion on such issues within the peace movements. What they have in common is the fact that they are strongly committed to the idea of a dialog and to the need to discuss their disagreements and the need to work these questions out. But there is very widespread disagreement within the movement about particular issues.

I would say that in East Germany the overwhelming majority of them do support the nuclear freeze. In Czechoslovakia, I would say a somewhat smaller number.

Mr. MARKEY. Well, let me ask you. Do any of these groups have any ability to influence their governments' policy or are they basically inconsequential in terms of policy making?

Dr. SAX. Well, I don't think, at least for the moment, they have much ability to influence their governments directly. They do not include any people who are in positions of power or authority. However, over the long term, I believe they have the ability to influence their countries by keeping discussions of these issues alive.

Furthermore, I think it is certainly well within the range of possibility that a number of influential officials within the govern-

ment may, in fact, be more sympathetic to the independent peace movements than they care to say openly, particularly in East Germany. I think that may be part of the reason why, although the peace activists have been dealt with harshly, as we have seen, they have, for the most part, not been dealt with as severely as critics or dissidents who have emphasized other issues, such as human rights.

Mr. MARKEY. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman FASCELL. Thank you very much, Dr. Sax. Very good testimony, and we appreciate your response to the many questions.

Dr. SAX. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman FASCELL. The Commission stands adjourned, subject to the call of the Chair.

[Whereupon, the hearing was adjourned at 11:27 a.m.]

[Statements and letters submitted for the record follow:]

COORDINATING COMMITTEE
OF
HUNGARIAN ORGANIZATIONS IN NORTH AMERICA

ISTVAN B. CEREBEN
EXECUTIVE SECRETARY

4101 BLACKPOOL ROAD
ROCKVILLE, MD 20853
TELEPHONE 301-871-7038

Independent Peace Movements in Hungary

Statement

of

The Coordinating Committee of Hungarian Organizations
in North America

Submitted

to

The Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe

May 22, 1984

There are two main groups in the independent peace movement in Hungary. The older one is that of the Catholic basis groups led by the Piarist priest, Gyorgy Bulanyi. A newer and less firmly established one is the Dialogue (Dialogus) for Peace founded in the late summer and early fall in 1982. There are other smaller, more spontaneously organized groups, many of which have only had a transitory existence.[1]

The Catholic basis groups are firmly rooted in theological ideas, and trace their pacifism to the teachings of Christ. They have challenged not only the Marxist authorities, whose ideology they completely reject, but have also questioned the offical stand of the Church, whose leader in Hungary, Cardinal Laszlo Lekai has made statements in favor of allegiance to "Hungary's Constitution" and by implication to the state. This stand of the hierarchy is based on a long pro-establishment tradition in the Hungarian Catholic leadership and is the reason for the sharp division between them and the basis communities under Bulanyi. The latter have in fact rejected the hierarchy's leadership, arguing that the Catholic Church cannot make compromises with a totalitarian Marxist state, lest it jeopardize its existence. Since the theorists of Marxism have often argued for the elimination of "superstitious religiousness" from the life of a socialist state, the basis groups have a solid foundation for their argument.

The concrete acts of the Bulanyists have consisted of refusing to do military service. Since 1979, a number of their young members (in their early twenties and late teens) have chosen military courts-martial and imprisonment rather than bear arms. The drastic measures[2] have not

discouraged Bulanyi or his followers, since they see these as merely opportunities for bearing witness to their faith.

Since they are so deeply religious, with many of their beliefs in the strengths of small communities and the need for a total rejection of the materialist assumptions of modern life harking back to the lifestyle of the early Christians in the Roman empire, and since the retributions against them are so extreme, analogies with Western peace movements are inappropriate. The religious groups who demonstrate for peace in the U.S. or in England or West Germany never have to face military courts-martial or two and three year sentences at hard labor.[3]

The "Dialogue for Peace" movement, or simply, "Dialogue," presents an interesting contrast to the above. The young people, mainly students, who were its initial members did not have the strong non-Marxist ideas that motivate the basis groups. They were and are more sympathetic to the idealism of peace in the West. Their tendency is to take the slogans for disarmament seriously, as a basis for an activist peace platform, with the proviso that these apply both in the East and in the West. Thus, they have included an element always missing from the offical peace declarations in Eastern Europe and the Soviet Union. They are calling for the dismantling of Nato rockets along with those of the Soviet Union and the Warsaw Pact. Their logical and obvious argument is that it does not matter to the victim whose nuclear bomb drops on him. Thus, to do away with these weapons of mass destruction, both sides must dismantle their existing installations.

What Dialogue has tried to do from the beginning of its activities in 1982 was to stay within the limits of Hungarian law. It has made an effort

to keep up contacts with both the National Peace Council and representatives of the state and party authorities. It tried, especially at the time of its inception to keep its distance from dissident intellectuals, but the facts of public life in Hungary have led to its disenchantment.

At first, the authorities showed "tolerance" when at a Budapest "peace festival," organized by the National Peace Council and the Budapest Communist Youth League (KISZ), members of Dialogue appeared with signs reading peace in English and in Russian, and "All Misseles Out of Europe." According to a quote in the English language service of MTI, the Hungarian news agency, a Hungarian Socialist Workers Party (HSWP) member of parliament said that, Hungary was willing to "maintain a dialogue with anyone, whether domestic or foreign, who thinks differently than we do but who shares our peace aspirations."[4]

Soon the tolerance which proved to be such a useful piece of propaganda for the regime in the West, and the "openness" of the authorities were followed by the less ostentatious methods so familiar to those who try to take an independent stand in Eastern Europe. On 19 April 1984, accouring to a report in the Italian Communist daily Unita,[5] plainclothesmen confiscated the valid passport of Ferenc Ruzsa, one of the leaders of the Dialogue peace group, at his apartment. It seems that he had been chosen as the group's delegate to a West Berlin peace rally. He had intended to visit London before the rally and meet with members of the European Nuclear Disarmament (END) movement, who had had earlier close contacts with Dialogue.

There were other searches and "unofficial" forms of intimidation, such as "friendly talks" with superiors at places of employment or with

university advisors, who encourage the young peace activists to aviod any contacts which would have jeopardized their future.

The peace group, which has had to learn a lot about Hungarian political reality since early 1983, when according to the UNITA reporter quoted above, it had approximately 300 members nationwide,[6] has gone through some transformations. As the Oslo daily, Ny Tid, reported, the movement was disolved in 1983.[7]

The dissolution came on the heels of a series of harsh, intimidating moves by the Hungarian authorities, aimed principally at dissident intellecutals but extended to include the leaders and the organizers of Dialogue. The occassion for the sudden "hardening" of the official line against any form of indepencence or autonomy was the ascension to power of Yurij Andropov. According to a dissident writer and editor, Gabor Demszky, who had himself been publicly beaten by the police and then tried for assaulting them in September, 1983, the authorities moved against the Dialogue peace movement 3 days before the party leader Janos Kadar was to make his first official visit to Yurij Andropov.[8]

The fact that the moderate peace group which insisted on respecting the laws of the land collapsed so quickly points up the dilemma of this type of initiative in Eastern Europe, and specifically in Hungary. It also points to the essence of a totalitarian system, even of one that is as "moderate"as Hungary's, so often touted for this trait in the Western media. A totalitarian state can only tolerate independence by any of its inhabitants as long as such acts do not threaten its power either from the inside, or raise doubts in the minds of the sponsors of the state (in this case, the

Soviets) about its ability to continue to exercise total control.

Thus, any group who either out of naivete or a sense of firm conviction, believes that it can challenge the state's supreme authority, must be ready either to make the most extreme sacrifices or must be ready to disslove itself. The two types of peace groups briefly described here are representative of these two possibilities.

The Catholic basis groups, because of the strenght of their commitment to their faith and their willingness to sacrifice their lives for their beliefs, continue to defy the state. They are a tiny minority of the population, but their defiance is of a far greater significance that their numbers. The state knows this, otherwise it would not be so ruthless in their persecution.

The members of the one-time Dialogue for Peace group have not been able to withstand the overwhelming power of the state. A few tenacious individuals have become dissidents, some have kept to their beliefs in the privacy of their homes, but their "movement" is in disarray. Too many of their followers were intimidated by the "friendly talks" of their university advisors or their supervisors. The threat of being cast out of society, of not being able to enjoy the minimal material security that Hungary would provide them today was enough to dissuade them from continuing their independent initiative. The lesson is obvious and yet, even for some in Hungary it bears repeating: in order to counter a totalitarian system, an individual or a group must have <u>inner</u> resources which are inaccessible to the authorities. Whatever the cause, only a commitment based on the strength of these could possibly hope for success.

NOTES

[1]A recent example of one of these spontaneous groups about which there is little avaliable information at this time is the "Shalom, Independent Peace Movement." It seems that a group of young Jewish intellectual issued a Manifesto protesting the action of Jewish leaders, who signed a joint declaration with other religious leaders condemning "U.S. imperialism that threatens would peace." The manifesto, which was smuggled, led to the West claimed that the "leaders of the Jewish Comminity in Budapest had no right to sign, on behalf of Hungarian Jewry, a unilateral declaration 'that ignores the role of Soviet weapons held by Arabs who are plotting to annihilate Isreal'." According to the Tel Aviv periodical, Yedi' Ot Aharonot of 27 March 1984 and the Hungarian language magazine a Het Tukre (Weekly Mirror) of 25 March 1984, the Hungarian authorities arrested the members of this independent peace group. Neither source provided further information about the status of the detaines or their subsequent activities.

[2]In one case discussed in the samizdat publication BESZELO 2, both a father and his son had been imprisoned for their beliefs.

[3]For more details on the activities, views, and the harsh treatment of these groups, see the issues of BESZELO, 1981 - 1983. We have not seen or heard of the first 1984 issue having appeared.

[4]Kossuth Radio, 6 May 1983.

[5]10 May 1983

[6]13 April 1983

[7]11 January 1984

[8]Quoted in Gnistan, Stockholm, 12 January 1984

The following reports were used in the preparation of this statement:

a. Italo Gugeri, "'Dialogue for Peace' Movement," in L'Unita, Rome, 13 April 1983.

b. "Independent but no Opposition," in Die Tageszeitung, Vienna, 1 July 1983.

c. Laszlo Kasza, "The Independent Hungarian Peace Movement,"in Irodalmi Ujsag, Paris, Number 3, 1983.

d. "Conflict Over Peace," in Ny Tid, Oslo, 11 January 1984.

e Steven Polgar, "A Summary of the Situation of the Catholic Church

in Hungary," in Religion in Communist Lands, Keston College, Kent, No. 1, 1984.

f. Miklos Haraszti, "Nem utni es nem vissza utni" (To strike not and not to strike back), BESZELO 2, Budapest, January 1982. (Hungarian samizdat periodical)

g. Anonymous, "Magyar Katolikus Maskent Gondolkodokhoz" (To the Catholic dissidents), BESZELO 1, Budapest, October, 1981.

h. Andras Vizonto, "Pacifista Mozgalom?" (Pacifist Movement?), BESZELO 4, Budapest, September, 1982.

i. Anonymous, "Beszelgetes egy Katolikus Pappal" (Conversation with a Catholic Priest), BESZELO 1, Budapest, October, 1981.

j. Anonymous, "Pacifista Mozgalom a Magyar Katolikus Egyhazban" (Pacifist Movement in the Hungarian Catholic Church), Ibid.

k. Csaba Kelemen, "Nyugtalansag a Katolikus Egyhazban" (Unrest in the Catholic Church), BESZELO 3, Budapest, May,1982.

l. Karoly Kiszei, "Nyilt Level Torvenyessegert" (Open Letter for Lawfulness), BESZELO 5-6, Budapest, December, 1982.

m. Gyorgy Petri, "A Radikalis Szerenysegrol" (About radical meekness), Ibid.

n. H. M. "Ujabb Katolikus Szolgalat Megtagadok" (Additional Catholics refusing military service), BESZELO 7, Budapest, April 1983.

JOINT BALTIC AMERICAN NATIONAL COMMITTEE

REPRESENTING
ESTONIAN AMERICAN NATIONAL COUNCIL
AMERICAN LATVIAN ASSOCIATION, INC.
LITHUANIAN AMERICAN COUNCIL, INC.

June 6, 1984

The Honorable Dante B. Fascell
Chairman
Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe
237 House Office Bldg.
Annex 2
Washington, D.C. 20515

Dear Mr. Fascell:

We herewith submit a statement by our committee on the plight of the signatories of the "Nordic Nuclear-Free Zone" document, issued October 10, 1981.

We respectfully ask that this statement be included in the records of the May 22nd hearings, which you chaired, on unofficial peace groups.

Sincerely,

Guntars Meierovics
American Latvian Association

Maido Kari
JBANC Chairman and
Estonian American National Council

John B. Genys
Lithuanian American Council

Anita Bedelis
Director of Public Relations

POST OFFICE BOX 432. – ROCKVILLE, MARYLAND 20850 U.S.A. – TELEPHONE (301) 340-1954

JOINT BALTIC AMERICAN NATIONAL COMMITTEE

REPRESENTING
ESTONIAN AMERICAN NATIONAL COUNCIL
AMERICAN LATVIAN ASSOCIATION, INC.
LITHUANIAN AMERICAN COUNCIL, INC.

TESTIMONY OF THE
JOINT BALTIC AMERICAN NATIONAL COMMITTEE
BEFORE THE
COMMISSION ON SECURITY AND COOPERATION
IN EUROPE
ON
MAY 22, 1984

The Joint Baltic American National Committee (JBANC) represents the three central Baltic-American organizations (the Estonian American National Council, the American Latvian Association, Inc., and the Lithuanian American Council, Inc.) and coordinates the presentation of issues to the United States Congress, government agencies and the general public.

Human rights issues play an important role in the United States policy of not recognizing the illegal and forceful incorporation of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania into the Soviet Union. Over the years, JBANC has gathered information on events in the three Baltic states which show that dissent, albeit limited at times, is firmly rooted and finds expression whenever possible in these countries.

JBANC maintains a great interest in the plight of the signers of the Nordic nuclear-free zone document issued in the Baltic states. On October 10, 1981, an open letter signed by 38 prominent Baltic dissidents was recently received in the West(copy of letter attached). Addressed to the heads of the governments of the U.S.S.R., Iceland, Norway, Denmark, Finland, and Sweden, the letter calls for inclusion of the Baltic states in any agreement to make Northern Europe and the Baltic Sea a nuclear-free zone.

POST OFFICE BOX 432. — ROCKVILLE, MARYLAND 20850 U.S.A. — TELEPHONE (301) 340-1954

The open letter calls for the extension of the nuclear-free zone to Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania, integral parts of Northern Europe. It further states that "the Baltic nations have paid dearly for the Great Power conflicts" and emphasizes that "the governments of the independent republics of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania made every effort to avoid involvement in the Great Power conflicts." Furthermore, the letter expresses open concern over the possible destruction of the small Baltic states in a superpower conflict; a theme which has been echoed in many statements smuggled out of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania in the past few years. The letter notes that the Baltic states continue to suffer from the violations of their neutrality during the Second World War and calls on government leaders to negotiate guarantees which would insure the survival of these small nations.

Many of the dissidents who signed this document are well known nationalists and human rights activists in Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania. Six of the individuals who signed the document also were signatories of the 1979 Baltic "45" appeal for self-determination. Five of the signers have been imprisoned (Heiki Ahonen, Ints Cālītis, Lagle Parek, Arvo Pesti, and Enn Tarto), and the remaining people have undergone harassment and interogation by the KGB.

In their respective countries, these people have become objects of derision, been denied housing, education and employment opportunities. The imprisonment and abuse of these individuals are contrary to the Helsinki Final Act and the articles of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. JBANC believes that by focusing attention on these people, public opinion can help secure the release of these prisoners or at least improve their detention conditions.

It is appropriate to note that the Soviet Union has not and does not tolerate views among its citizens which deviate from the official line advanced by the highest organs of the Communist Party. There is an "unofficial" peace movement in the Soviet Union, but its members are confined by the authorities to insane asylums or are politically persecuted for "slandering" the Soviet Union. That part of the Soviet population which has the greatest vested interest in this issue -- the people of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania -- has spoken up, but the signatories to the open letter, as mentioned before, have also been subjected to persecution and imprisonment by the authorities.

The Joint Baltic American National Committee urges all members of the Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe to take note and publicize the brave efforts of the signatories to the open letter. We believe that these individuals who, as a result of expressing their beliefs, have been imprisoned under the harshest conditions by Soviet authorities do not deserve this treatment.

Translation from Estonian

To: The Heads of the Governments of the USSR, Iceland, Norway, Denmark, Finland and Sweden Concerning the Establishment of a Nuclear-Free-Zone in North Europe

O P E N L E T T E R

The peoples and the Governments of North Europe are at present considering various aspects of the idea of establishing a nuclear-free zone in North Europe, expressed by the Chairman of the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of the USSR. Herewith we pronounce to supplement the above idea by including the Baltic Sea and the Baltic countries - Estonia, Latvia and Lithuania - in the above-mentioned nuclear-free zone.

The extension of the nuclear-free zone to the Baltic Sea and to the Baltic countries would be logical because the area in question is actually a part of North Europe. Moreover, this would render a possible future treaty all the more important because it would be a brilliant example of an equal and balanced disarmament. The extension of the nuclear-free zone to the Baltic Sea and to the Baltic countries would also be in the interests of the small Scandinavian and Baltic nations, more particularly by contributing to their future survival.

The Baltic nations have paid dearly for the Great Power conflicts. Their sufferings were particularly deep during the Second World War when the front passed twice over their territories. Here it must be emphasised that the Governments of the independent republics of Estonia, Latvia and Lithuania made every effort to avoid involvement in the Great Power conflicts. The Baltic nations know, too, that the leaders of the Great Powers of that time ignored completely the wishes, the fate and the opinions of the Baltic peoples when they divided the area into their spheres of influence. A drastic example of this is the Pact of August 23, 1939, between Nazi Germany and the USSR, and its secret appendix which has not been published in the USSR to this day.

Because of the above we consider it extremely important to devise guarantees which would help ensure the survival of small nations in case of possible Great Power conflicts.

We consider it natural and acceptable to all nations that an agreement concerning a nuclear-free zone in North Europe would ban the production and stationing of nuclear weapons, as well as the stationing and movements of any means (ships, aircraft, missiles) designed to carry nuclear warheads, in the appropriate territories of the High Contracting Parties and in the Baltic Sea.

We hope that the NATO and the Warsaw Pact Powers will be able to guarantee the ban on nuclear weapons in the nuclear-free zone in North Europe, including the Baltic Sea and the Baltic countries. Such a ban on nuclear weapons in one area would be an important step towards the fulfilment of the greatest expectations of mankind - A COMPLETE DISARMAMENT.

October 10, 1981

Eva Ahonen
Heiki Ahonen
A. Andriuskaite
Rein Arjukese
Ivars Blankenfelds
Birute Burauskaite
Ints Cālītis
K. Cernicuskiene
Ülle Einasto
Gunnars Gūtmanis
Ilse Heinsalu
Karin Inno
Urmas Inno
A. Kazlauskas
R. Kazlauskiene
V. Kazlauskaite
V. Kiela
Aija Krūmiņa
Inta Kārkliņa
Kārlis Lapiņš
Jānis Liepiņš
Evalds Līžberskis
Laimonis Lūsis
Astra Niedre
Juris Niedre
Lagle Parek
Arvo Pesti
Elmars Prauliņš
Eve Pärnaste
Endel Ratas
Gunārs Stefans
Pēteris Stockmanis
Māra Zīle
Enn Tarto
Erik Udam
Jonas Petkevičius
Ona Poškiene-Lukauskaite
L. Kulvietite

OPEN LETTER OF CHARTER 77 TO THE VARIOUS PEACE MOVEMENTS IN THE WORLD

Document No. 13 - 1982

We want to emphasize again that we realize the seriousness of the situation and that we value the importance of a peace movement of ordinary citizens. As signatories of a document which is based on adherence to human rights standards, we are aware of the fact that without peaceful co-existence, one of the basic human rights -- the right to life -- would be threatened.

However, we are of the opinion that peace is indivisible. In order to secure peace, it would be necessary to exclude force and the threat of use of force, to secure respect for the rights of nations in international relations, as well as to end the violations and lawlessness inside the state. It would also be necessary to secure respect for human rights by the authorities in each country -- with particular regard for human freedom and dignity, including the freedom of thought, faith, assembly, expression, etc. We wish to stress that there are values for which a human life may have to be sacrificed and for which life has been sacrificed (more than once).

We are of the opinion that it is not possible to believe in the genuineness of peace initiatives in places where basic human rights are suppressed or where the suppression of human rights is being met with silence or even approval. We must not forget that many infamous or disgraceful actions were committed in the name of peace. For example, in 1938, Dalladier and Chamberlain gave in to Hitler's and Mussollini's pressure, thereby enabling further expansion of totalitarian regimes and contributing to the cause of World War II -- all in the name of the preservation of peace in Europe. For their actions, these statesmen were hailed by many newspapers and by a large segment of the public in their own countries.

We are also convinced that the close relationship and mutual interdependence of peaceful co-existence and cooperation with consistent respect for basic human rights and freedoms, human dignity and moral values is the only way through which the peace movement can forcefully and effectively express itself and realize its goals.

Even though we realize the scope of the present danger, (unlike the present, in the past there was always the expectation of some life after a war) we feel that only in embracing all human rights can peace really be called peace. In addition, peace should not only be a momentary strategy of power, or the naive wish of those who want to cling to life at any price without regard for human responsibility to values which transcend life.

As signatories of Charter 77, but also as citizens of Europe whose civilization dates from ancient Greece and Christianity, and which, except for a few omissions, has been noted for its ability to recognize this human responsibility, we are bound not to abandon the basic requirements of human rights, including notably, the right to life and, thereby, efforts for peace.

In view of the fact that Europe and the world face very real dangers and that efforts for peace by official social groupings can come under suspicion since they usually operate within the framework of political or power configurations, we feel that these questions could best be addressed by unofficial citizens' initiatives. We have already had a chance to exchange views with representatives of the peace movements of certain countries and we would welcome further discussions or meetings with regard to these issues.

Dr. Radim Palous, Anna Marvanova, Ladislav Lis
Charter 77 spokespersons

Charter 77 Document No. 20/83 (Informal Translation)
Open Letter to the World Congress for Peace and Life
Against Nuclear War.

To the assembled delegates:

You, as delegates to the Congress for Peace and Life, are deeply concerned with the fate of the world. You are, to an unusual degree, attuned to the frightening depth of the crisis in which mankind finds itself. It is with one of the aspects of this crisis, which one might call the "crisis of peace", that you will be considering at your conference.

Today many regions of the world, althought not actually at war, are not really at peace. This is because there is no peace between the citizens of a state and its government, the basis for any sensible human community. Wherever this type of peace is lacking, there is also no guarantee of external peace. A government that does not serve its citizens, which is oblivious to their opinions and their basic rights, and which places itself above any public control, falls prey to the urge to expand its influence further, even in an "outward" direction. By suppressing public opinion and civic rights, a government tends to respond only to its own narrow interests, increasingly ignoring general human concerns. It thereby becomes a danger to all, not only because of the inherently expansive nature of its goals, but also because, by becoming more adroit at manipulating its citizens, it is able to gain their support, albeit unwilling, for any endeavor.

Such a government, having excluded from public discussion its own military preparations, will have the latitude to do virtually anything. Moreover, a government which denies the truth about conditions and events within its own borders can hardly expect to gain the trust of other governments, even if it is sincerely trying to come to an understanding with them. A country which lives in a constant state of tension between its people and government is in many repects "mobilized", so that in discussions with other countries it is not perceived as a reliable partner seeking a genuine and lasting peace, but rather as a questionable one more interested in a peace which suits its own ends and is achieved on its own terms.

The world's greatest powers do not trust each other, which renders negotiations between them so very difficult. Their suspicion and mistrust come from their experiences in dealing with each other. They know better than anyone else how easy it is to flout solemnly signed agreements, and they understand the temptation of dividing the world into spheres of influence. They also know how to manipulate and suppress the legitimate interests of their citizens, sometimes inconspicuously and subtly, at other times directly and brutally.

There can be no genuine peace without genuine trust; and there can be no genuine trust as long as the selfish interests (despite whatever noble phrases may be used to disguise them) of the various political establishments remain more important that the real well-being of all peoples, all nations, and of the whole world.

This profound and fundamental sense of responsibility for the future of mankind can only be injected into the thinking of governments through the pressures and concerns of hundreds of thousands, even millions, of ordinary men and women. However, this is unlikely to happen without a profound shift in the mentality of today's society. Man must cease being a captive of his won limited vision of selfish happiness, which confines his horizon and makes him indifferent to wider issues, because this, by itself, will eventually jeopardize his happiness.

We see the present peace movement as one attempt to bring about such a change in man's thinking. We, who are also concerned with the fate of mankind, are therefore willing to enter into a dialogue with the movement and to cooperate with it. We welcome the peace movement and consider ourselves linked to it by the same basic desire to work for a better future. It is this very desire which prompts us to reiterate certain deeper aspects of the problem of peace, especially those to which our specific experience has sensitized us.

A close link exists between peace and human rights, as has already been noted above. We believe this to be more than simply a connection between two different, more or less independent phenomenon, but rather two indivisible aspects of the same problem: a world crisis that is a crisis of responsibility in general. This crisis has additional important dimensions, such as the deepening chasm between rich and poor regions of the world, the continuing devastation of the natural environment, and the absurd wasting of the natural riches hidden in our earth. To ignore any of these dimensions in the general discussion would be self-delusion and would condemn it from the outset to failure.

We of course welcome international negotiations aimed at reducing armaments. We rejoice at every sign of success, however limited, as well as at every new attempt by one side to arrive at some sort of understanding with the other. Such partial successes, however, can only contribute to the maintenance of the present state of "non-war". They help to cool hot heads, to restrain militaristic dreams, to curb the expansion of the arms industry. These limited negotiations by themselves cannot, however, foster genuine peace, but can merely help create more favorable conditions for it by fostering an atmosphere in which it is easier (but not easy) to strive for real peace. The underlying causes of the present deplorable state of affairs cannot be removed by limited arms negotiations, no matter how successful. The numerical

reduction of dreaded weapons by several hundred on each side will do nothing to bring about real security on this planet. By security, we mean a truly humane existence, dignified, just, and free, one based on mutual respect and understanding, and characterized by an unflinching resolve to contest anything that jeopardizes it anywhere in the world. This type of security cannot exist in the shadow of the current military balance, even if the number of weapons is reduced.

Charter 77 is a citizens's movement which, although independent of the state, does not seek to oppose the authority of the state or to supplant it. Its sole concern is to work toward a situation where human beings will be able to live in freedom as human beings, in other words where a citizen will live in genuine peace, at peace with himself, with his fellow citizens, with his government, with citizens of other lands, and, lastly, at peace with citizens of future generations.

This ideal has brought together over a thousand citizens of different views and backgrounds from the county which is host to your conference. Despite the many difficulties and obstacles placed in their way, these citizens have worked toward this ideal for over six years. They consider it their duty to express their opinions on questions of war and peace, in particular by stressing that there can be no peace without freedom. They consider it to be fundamental that "human rights" and "peace" are but mutually dependent aspects, mutually dependent conditions of a truly humane life on earth. Any attempt to promote one at the expense of the other-- for example, by furthering peace at the expense of freedom-- will in the end fail to advance either.

Charter 77 will not be taking part in your conference only because it is not being permitted to participate. We therfore send you our greeting in the form of this statement. We have also enclosed our samizdat publication Charter 77 on Peace to help you understand the thinking of Charter 77 members on the peace issue. It was compiled on the occasion of your Peace Congress and intended as a contribution to it. It contains several Charter 77 documents dealing with the subject of world peace, in addition to some essays written by Charter 77 signatories or citizens who share its aims. We ask you to read it and accept it as proof that we too treat questions of world peace with utmost seriousness, despite our involvement in other issues and problems.

We all agree that the future of this planet is of concern to each and every one of us. We therefore have the right to know how those who represent us at international disarmament conferences deal with the issues involved and what these talks achieve. For this reason we propose that the final resolution of your conference include an appeal to all governments urging that they inform thir citizens fully and objectively about the outcome of the discussions, in addition to the proposals made

by all parties. The purpose would be to acquaint their citizens with both their own government's arguments and statistics, as well as those put forward by other parties to the negotiations.

It is difficult to think of a more modest concession on the part of a government to its citizens, but yet one which could prove to be very significant, for it would open to public scrutiny the actions of every government in this most important area of activity. It would also represent a major contribution to the success of the talks themselves and would be an important step toward public supervision of social forces which are today extremely difficult to control. Furthermore, it would not just be a contribution to the "non-war" discussed at international disarmament talks, but also a big step on the road to a genuine peace, a fundamental concern of us all. Such peace, because it would be created and guaranteed by all of us, would not benefit one side only and would not be achieved at the expense of anyone. It therefore offers life in freedom for all. Peace as the state of the world and human existence is our common goal.

We wish your Congress success!

Prague, June 15, 1983

(Note: the statement was signed by 15 former Charter 77 spokesmen, all who have even served in that capacity except for Zdenis Tomin, who is living abroad in exile, and Ladislav Lis and Rudolf Baattek, who were in prison at the time. This indicates that the document is considered by Charter 77 to be a comprehensive and well thought out summary of the movement's views on the subject of peace and its relationship to basic human rights).

Open Letter form Vaclav Havel to Dr. Vilem Precan in conjunction with a November 26, 1983 peace symposium in Franken, West Germany. (Informal Translation)

The Peace Movement and Charter 77

Charter 77 is not a peace movement as the term is understood in the West, namely one focused on a single issue. Charter 77's objectives are more extensive. Given the environment in which it operates, it would be inadequate to dwell on narrowly focused issues, not only in terms of principle, but for practical reasons as well. History teaches us that such single-issue efforts do not result in lasting peace. Just as war is not an "accidental" phenomenon without deeper and more fundamental causes, neither is peace. It is not possible to have peace simply because we are striving for it. We must also work to create the conditions that make peace possible. In other words, we have to work to eliminate the underlying causes of war.

Today's crisis of peace is a manifestation of a deeper, more extensive international crisis. Charter 77 signatories share the universal longing for peace. They are also ready to struggle for it publicly, taking all sorts of risks within the broader context of their fight for a freer, more equitable, and more humane world, where the yardstick for measuring values is how well the interests of the individual are served, not those of this or that dehumanized power. If peace is threatened because of the current international crisis, then we must strive to remove the causes of the problems, not only their manifestations.

In this spirit, Charter 77 has tackled the problem of peace several times in recent years. It has engaged in a dialogue with various peace movements in the West. For the most part, its explanations of its point of view have been met with approval, or at least understanding, by these various peace movements.

Nonetheless, criticism has been voiced that Charter 77, because of its contact with some of the movements in the West, has taken political stands and that it has even compromised itself. Such criticism shows a lack of understanding of the basic premises of Charter 77.

It is not a political party and has no political ambitions or interests. It must therefore remain free from special interests and political sloganeering in order not to betray its raison d'être. This makes it possible for Charter 77 to enter into dialogue with anyone, and impossible for it to exclude those of different opinions. For the same reason, it does not bar anyone from signing Charter 77.

Truth, for the signatories of Charter 77, is not a "fetish" to be hidden away from the views of outsiders. There is nothing to hide. Its purpose is to address others and communicate with them. This commits us to be open to the views and ideas of others and requires that we be able to defend our own. It also preserves the option to change our ideas, if this is warranted.

Dialogue is shunned only by those for whom the truth is a thing which, in order to protect its purity, has to be guarded carefully from contacts with anyone whose ideas are different. Charter 77 does not have such fears about its truth. In addition, I am also convinced that if it were to start to choose its partners according to their "importance", it would lose everyone's support. Charter 77 was founded on respect for others, on openness and courage in all situations, and on the premise that it will attest to its truth at all times. It has, through the present, always acted in accordance with this premise.

Vaclav Havel

Charter 77 Document No.38/83: Open Letter to Western Peace Movements

Dear Friends,

It is less than half a year since some of you were able to meet us in Prague during the "World Assembly for Peace and Life, Against Nuclear War". During this time, we had the opportunity to follow your courageous protests, especially against the deployment of missiles in Europe. In this letter, we want to inform you briefly about the current situation of Charter 77.

Recently, the Czechoslovak government decided to deploy missiles on our territory. In connection with this, the secret police interrogated almost 20 Charter 77 signatories, including spokespersons, for many hours during the first days of November. On this occasion, we were told that if Charter 77 expressed its opinion on the deployment of missiles in Czechoslovakia, we would be prosecuted for undermining national defense capability.

Charter 77 is aware that the threat of force and confrontational tactics which we have been witnessing recently in international relations frustrates the hope encouraged by the Madrid talks. This negation of the genuine desire of people for détente - irrespective of borders - reinforces the adverse situation of division and hostility between states. Charter 77 wishes to contribute to the overcoming of this disquietening situation by continuing to fulfil the tasks which it assumed at its foundation almost seven years ago - the defense of human rights. As we agreed in a joint statement which we were able to sign with several of you last June in Prague, the struggle for peace is for us possible - as it is anywhere in a civilized world - only as an integral part of an endeavour to observe human rights in the sense described in several binding international covenants and agreements which were also ratified by the Czechoslovak government.

We wish your struggle every success. We support your demands that the world superpowers accelerate the disarmament negotiations in order to end the arms race.

Prague, November 1983

Rudolf Battěk, Charter 77 spokesperson currently in prison

Ladislav Lis, Charter 77 spokesperson currently in prison

Jan Kozlík Charter 77 spokesperson

Marie Rút Křížková Charter 77 spokesperson

Anna Marvanová Charter 77 spokesperson

NOTE: Translation by Palach Press Limited. For a complete compilation of Charter 77 and VONS documents, related essays and letters, and analytic articles from March 1983 to March 1984, see Pallach Press Bulletin No. 24 (April 1984)

Letter from Czechoslovak Citizens to their Government Protesting the Deployment of Nuclear Weapons in Czechoslovakia
(Unofficial Translation)

To the President of Czechoslovakia
To the Government of Czechoslovakia

Ever since the decision was made to deploy nuclear weapons in Czechoslovakia, we have felt that the danger to our country, to the whole world, and to all humanity has become more imminent. The arms race is accelerating.

When we talk about peace, deeply and sincerely, we cannot be indifferent to any increase in weaponry. We therefore protest against nuclear weapons anywhere in the world. We protest against their deployment in Czechoslovakia.

February 1, 1984

The letter was signed by
939 Czechoslovak citizens.

Charter 77 Document 9/84 (Informal Translation)
Open Letter to the British Peace Movements CND and END

Dear Friends:

Thank you for your letters commenting on our initiatives of last fall. We are grateful for the support you expressed in your letters as well as that which you demonstrated through your activities. We are pleased that our stands on a number of basic issues have been brought closer together and that this growing mutual understanding is generating the possibility of further dialogue and even concrete cooperation.

We must now, however, frankly state a few basic facts. Charter 77, because of its composition, is not, does not wish to be, and cannot be a peace movement. It is not any kind of a movement. Rather it is a permanent, joint initiative of individual citizens of different ages, occupations, political views, and religious convictions who are linked together by a feeling of concern and responsibility for the troubled situation in our country and by a determination to seek ways to bring about its improvement. Our efforts are based on an unshakeable respect for certain basic values, such as freedom, justice, and the dignity of man. Although it is perhaps not entirely accurate, our objective is often described as the protection of human and civic rights.

Charter 77 does not conform to the usual definition of a movement. Rather, it views itself as an organization in pursuit of a "purpose". In essence, it strives to foster a general sense of concern and co-responsibility, and not to attract a mass following. It is not able to pursue concrete political goals, at least not in the narrow sense of the term "politics".

It is even less accurate to view Charter 77 as a peace movement. Naturally, we are well aware that peace, which protects life itself, is essential for freedom, justice and human dignity. In this sense the maintenance of peace is a legitimate and basic part of our efforts. The world "peace", however, can be used in different contexts. It can mean inner peace within an individual's soul. It can also mean civic peace, the peaceful relations between citizens and state and among individual citizens, a peace based on justice. The term can also mean peaceful coexistence among nations. There is, of course, a long difficult road from the current tense situation, more aptly described as the "absence of war", to the achievement of real peace.

It should be clear from all that we stand for that we consider efforts to place the problem of peace on a strictly spiritual basis, viewing it as the inner salvation of isolated individuals, to be dangerous and foolish. We also see as

dangerous and foolish efforts to view peace exclusively in terms of treaties, limited arms agreements, and the temporary reduction of tensions among states and blocs, but without changing their ability and readiness to wage war.

We also feel it necessary to object to a letter to us from END which ascribes to us the view that governments (that is, in the West) which increase armaments in the name of basic democratic freedoms and human rights only bring closer the danger of nuclear war in Europe and thus endanger the very civilization from which these principles stem. We have never stated nor implied such a conviction because, for most of us, such a formulation is unacceptable for its unwarranted onesidednesss and for its political naivete.

We are aware that nuclear weapons with the potential for total annihilation have created a new qualitiative situation to which traditional views can only be applied with caution. We are also aware of the potential danger hidden in a government's decisive and militant stand, even if taken in the name of the defense of human and democratic values: "temporary" restrictions on rights during a crisis can result in their total suspension because, as far as authority is concerned, these rights represent constraints. We are, however, far from placing aggression and defense, aggressor and victim, on the same level.

We do not agree with the senseless stockpiling of weapons, which poses a serious threat to mankind, but we opoose just as firmly steps toward unilateral disarmament and unreciprocated concessions. Such steps would, in the present international context (characterized by a lack of honesty, trust, and, above all, of civilian control of the military) increase the danger for mankind. Fear is a powerful brake on aggression. Nothing is more dangerous than to expose those who can push the button to start a new (and last) war to dreams about a possible victory and "life hereafter".

In addition, we have personally experienced, unlike you, that apart from nuclear war there are other, less obvious but no less effective means to bring about the extinction of civilization. At least some of us (and we are bound by a general consensus) therefore prefer the risk of a firm stand over the certainty of the disastrous consequences of appeasement.

This disclaimer was necessary because a statement unacceptable to us was actually attributed to Charter 77. We also disagree with a number of other views expressed in the letters of both of your movements, but we welcome the expression of your views attributed as such. A good dialogue can only exist where there are differences, and Charter 77, out of principle, will not exclude itself from an honest dialogue. The Charter is, in many respects, based on the conviction that an open dialogue is the only way through which it is possible

--while maintaining and respecting all political, ideological, and religious differences-- to reach an agreement on and stop the current devaluation of the fundamental values of human freedom, justice, and dignity.

We will certainly not be deterred from engaging in a dialogue with you by either the threat of increased repression or the loss of trust on the part of our friends. We welcome the opportunity to interact with genuine peace movements, as opposed to the institutions created on orders from a power structure and which pursue only tactical goals. In our opinion, your movements are not a product of foreign ideological manipulation, irrational fear, or a flight from real and important decisions (although this danger must be guarded against), but an expression of a deep civic responsibility and commitment to human life and its basic values. We consider your belief in classic democratic structures and political mechanisms to be close to our own. We also share your view that new ways must be found out of the current crisis.

We therefore value the opportunity to have a dialogue with your movements which we believe will modify and enrich not only the positions of those conducting the dialogue, but also of those who are following it. So long as there is real consideration for our respective points of view, along with the good will to understand the necessity for these differences and to give them a sense of convergence, the dialogue has the potential to evolve toward fruitful cooperation. Without such cooperation to span the frontiers of blocs, ideological schemes, and different experiences, that indivisible ideal for which we are striving-- be it in the name of peace or in the name of human and democratic rights-- has no chance to succeed.

May 1, 1984 Dr. Vaclav Benda Jiri Ruml Jana Sternova
Charter 77 Spokesmen

○